VINDICIÆ FOEDERIS;

OR, A

TREATISE

OF THE

Covenant of God

ENTERED WITH

MAN-KINDE,

In the ſeveral Kindes and Degrees of it,

IN WHICH

The agreement and reſpective differences of the *Covenant of Works* and the *Covenant of Grace*, of the *Old* and *New Covenant* are diſcuſt.

The *Conditions* of the *Covenant of Grace* on mans part, are aſſigned and aſſerted.

The juſt *latitude* and *extent* clearly held forth, and fully vindicated.

Several *Corollaries* containing many *heads* of *Divinity*, now controverted, and *practical points* ſingularly uſeful, inferred.

In particular the *neceſſity of a conſtant ſettled Miniſtry* (to bring men into *Covenant*, and to bring them up to the *termes* of it,) and of *Schooles*, and *Nurſeries* of *Learning*, and an *orderly call* in tendency to it.

Infant Baptiſme in that *latitude*, as now in uſe in *reformed Churches* maintained.

Newly corrected and much enlarged, & in many places cleared by its Author.

Thomas Blake, late Miniſter of the Goſpel, at *Tamworth* in the Counties of *Stafford* and *Warwick*.

Whereunto is annexed, a Sermon preached at his Funeral by Mr. *Anthony Burgeſſe*, and a Funeral Oration made at his death by Mr. *Samuel Shaw*.

The ſecond Edition.

All this is come upon us, yet have we not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falſely in the Covenant, Pſal. 44. 17.

London, Printed for *Abel Roper*, at the Sun againſt St. *Dunſtans* Church in *Fleet ſtreet*. 1658

30.8.1914

To his Reverend, and much Honoured Friend,

Mr. *SAMUEL HILDERSAM*,
Bachelar in Divinity, and Paſtor of
Weſt-*Felton* in the County of S*alop*;

Together with

Mrs. MARY HILDERSAM,
his pious Conſort.

NO time can wear out the memory of thoſe favours which I have received from your hands; You were of the firſt that gave me a viſit, when few durſt adventure themſelves under the ſame roof, being by the good providence of God, neceſſitated to leave a place ſorely afflicted with the Peſtilence; and labouring under a Feaver, wherewith preſently on my departure God pleaſed to afflict me: and were eye-witneſſes of the mean accommodations, which in thoſe

ſtraits could be provided for me and my reverend brother, with both our wives and families, all caſt upon the ſame condition at that time;& you made it appear that your eyes affected your hearts, in giving a free invitation to me, and thoſe that had dependance upon me, to your houſe, aſſoon as with ſecurity we durſt adventure over any mans threſhold, where for many moneths we had free and liberal entertainment. If *Paul* in an Epiſtle did remember the like from *Oneſiphorus* (with ſpecial obſervation, that he was not aſhamed of his chaine) my heart muſt needs have checked me, if having opportunity of Epiſtling according to received cuſtom, you ſhould have been forgotten. *I* ſhall not be aſhamed of the language of beggers, if they have learnt it from ſuch a hand; *The Lord grant unto you, that ye may finde mercy from the Lord in that day.* In your houſe I had not only leiſure to make a good progreſſe in this Work, but ſingular accommodation from your accompliſht Library. So that you have not only a deſerved intereſt in the Author, but in the Work it ſelf; upon ſight of one part, you have often called upon me for publication of the whole. So that if the Reader reap any benefit, he may ſee how large

large a ſhare in the thanks is yours. I know you affect not *Panegyricks*, neither am I fitted for them, nor was ever accuſtomed to them. There is much publiſhed to the world of one of you in the life of your reverend Father, to whom I have often in my thoughts applied that of Doctor *Hall* concerning learned *Whittaker*; *Who ever ſaw him without reverence, or heard him without wonder?* Having led the Reader through his glory, they adde: *And yet his name with the lively picture of his perſon lives, in his worthy ſonne, Maſter* Samuel Hilderſam; *whoſe learning* Cambridge *knew, when he was Fellow of Emmanuel Colledge; and whoſe preſent Miniſterial labours, and pious converſation at Weſt-*Felton *in* Shropſhire, *do perpetuate the honour of his Reverend Father; whoſe memory he doth much reverence; and whoſe rich vertues both perſonal and miniſteriall he doth happily imitate.* And it is not little that is ſaid of the other, where it is remembred, that *you were propounded by him, for a meet wife for his deareſt ſonne*; and recorded *that he was heard with affection to ingeminate theſe words*; *Never man had a kinder daughter in Law.* To be a follower of ſuch a precident, and to be found worthy of ſuch a Teſtimony, is a greater

er glory, than all the noble blood that ran through the veines of the greateſt of either of your Anceſtors. Let this ſmall piece finde a roome in your Study and Cloſet, and teſtifie to the world that gratitude lives in the breaſt of

Your moſt affectionate friend and ſervant,

THO. BLAKE.

From my ſtudy in *Tamworth*, Novemb. 4. 1652.

To

READER,

THe Reverend Authour of this Treatiſe is already known to the Preſſe by his former Labours, which do give ſo faire a character of his worth, and beſpeak of thee ſo ready an entertainment of this excellent piece, that were it not, that in this glut of books wherewith the world is cloyed, it might be unhappily buried out of thy ſight; We neither need, nor ſhould prefix theſe few lines, tanquam digitum indicem, to point thee to it. The ſubject about which it is converſant, is of nobleſt ranke; viz. The Covenant of Almighty God with Man-kind, which is diſtinguiſht into its kindes; of Works, of Grace. And this againe, according to the ſeveral formes or modes thereof, Old and New, which how they reſpectively take hands and agree, wherein they ſhake hands, and part. What the terms of the Covenant of Grace are, as propounded by God, and what the conditions on mans part, whereupon he (being thereunto reſponſal) becomes truely a confederate, what is the amplitude and comprehenſiveneſſe thereof in reſpect of the perſons that have right to claim to the priviledges or intereſts of it, are all ſet forth in their various colours, and ſo drawne to the life, that thy ſpirit is not like to be tired with

with reading; but led on with an appetite so sharp and quick, that when thou arrivest at the end, thou wilt complaine of the shortnesse of the way. For in the doctrine of the Covenant truly stated, an Orthodox Faith hath sure foundation; thence practick godlinesse receives powerful influence and obligation. Thereby very many errours of several sorts of Erroniſts, *as by a teste or standard are rectified, or discovered; from thence our Sacraments do as it were receive a soul, and those pertinent and seasonable digressions following in this book, concerning the necessity of a settled Ministry, &c. do by consequence receive both strength and usefulnesse. As concerning the remains of a former controversie about* Pædobaptiſme, *which are presented to thee in this Book, they are not out of their own place in a Treatise of the Covenant. We shall not adventure to say any more thereabout, but in imitation of that of Mr.* Hooker *in the Preface to his* Eccleſiaſtical Politie, *shall crave leave to re-minde all agitatours of that or any other controversie. That* the time will come, *when a few words delivered with meeknesse of wisdome, shall afford them more comfort, than great volumes written with scornefulnesse, and in the ferment of a sower and angry spirit; for 'tis an honour to any man to be a* Slave *to another mans reason, and* Maſter *of his own passions,* vale.

Thine in the Lord Jesus,

Richard Vines.
Sam. Fisher.

A Preface to the READER.

BEing by the good providence of God heretofore engaged, in the vindication of ſeveral truths, which were of concernment to his Church, eſpecially, the *Birth-priviledge and Covenant-holineſſe of the iſſue of beleevers*, I was unwilling to be ſilent, when a ſpirit of oppoſition prevailed, leſt the truth (for which I had ſtood, and make it my glory ever to own) ſhould ſuffer. In a deſigne of this nature, the greateſt queſtion with me was how to proceed to the beſt advantage of truth; perſonal conflicts are highly weariſome, and ungrateful, there is much time ſpent with very little ſatisfaction to the Reader, even where moſt ſatisfaction is given to an adverſarie He muſt be followed in ſuch paths that he goes, which often are not very acceptable to the Reader to accompany. And for the buſineſſe in hand, *viz.* the vindication of a beleevers fœderall holyneſſe till the ground work be right laid, and well underſtood, the ſuperſtructure in any ſuch diſpute (managed in the moſt dextrous way that is conceivable) will ſcarce ſettle thoſe that are weak, and not yet well informed or eſtabliſhed. I judged it therefore a way moſt ſatisfactory, and of greateſt and moſt probable hopes, for the clearing, not only of this Controverſie, but many more now in agitation, to adventure upon a full Treatiſe of the Covenant, which God hath entered with man, and the various diſpenſations, and diverſifications of it; whether ſuch as were occaſioned by mans fall, or that God according to

his Sovereignty, by his just Prerogative hath been pleased to order; where this is not in some measure clear, many truths of great weight must needs lie obscure. Master *Baxters* words in his Preface to the Reader before his *Aphorismes* of Justification are very remarkable: *It is not in studies* (saith he) *as it is in manifactures, that one man may begin where another left; but every man must fetch it from the very principles himself, neither can we take the words of those that have studied it before us for that is neither a sound nor satisfactory knowledge* (quoting Mr. *Pemble*,) *thence it comes to passe that while we are busie in examining our fore-fathers inventions, and posterity imployed in trying our Examinations, neither we nor they have much time to adde any thing for the encrease of learned knowledge*. Now the Covenant must needs be the principle where we must begin to get knowledg of the seals of the Covenant; This way therefore (resting on divine assistance) I have chosen, quickened to it as by the excellency and great concernment of the subject, so also by the desires of many that this thing in a just Treatise might be handled; And when my thoughts were most full of it, and busiest about it, and some preparations made for the work; the Stationer by letter solicited, that I would enlarge my *Birth-priviledge*, and fit it to these present times, and he would see it published; Hereupon I went on in the work (a Scheme of which follows here in an Analytical Table) in which I have received help from many (as my slender furniture, and strength with leasure to attend the perusal of them would give leave) yet I have tied my self to follow none; I think there is scarce any thing in which I am singular, I have so much childish fear as scarce to dare to walk in publick where I am alone, yet in several things I shall be found to dissent from others, and those of eminent name with whom I should blush to have any thoughts of comparison: There are dissentings among those that are of highest re[illegible]. In such

such case no inferior can agree with both parties, and therefore it must not be deemed any piece of arrogance or singularity, to leave the one: where I am put to it to differ, the Reader shall finde my reason, together with my opinoin. If better light lead him another way, I shall never desire he shall go with me blindfold, or leave the truth to have me his companion, yet least in leaving me, he should let go the truth it self, I shall only request an unprejudiced and unbyas'd judgement; If he bring a blood-shot eye, all will appear of a wrong colour. It cannot be hoped but that wading through so many particulars, I shall meet with opposition frō some hands; I would only let such know first, that I have made no man my adversary out of will, as desirous to be a man of contentions. I sometimes close with my greatest adversaries, and sometimes dissent from my most honoured, and admired friends: I think I have as strong an antipathy against quarrels, as *Luthers* against covetousness: I only leave where that light that for present I enjoy, leads me another way. 2. That I have wrote nothing but that which as I beleeve, so I resolve (God assisting) to hold, till a more clear light detect my errour. There are few things that have vented, but many yeers have held my thoughts, words or shews, will not work me out of them. 3. That I am not yet so wedded to an opinion, but am ready to yeeld up my self to be over-ruled by reason; He is the happiest man that lies under the conquest of truth. 4. That no man shall displease me that will deal argumentatively with me either by the clear immediate testimony of Scripture, or arguments by just consequence derived from them; but in case I shall meet with such dealing as I have found, to have my words by enterchange made not mine, but the adversaries own, my Arguments misrepresented, and held out to the halves; I shal give those leave to hold up and pursue quarrels with their own fancies. My years and employments, toge-

The Authour dissent from some.

ther with my weaknesses, will be [illegible] apology
hold me back from intermedling in [illegible]es. And for the
Reader that would read for satisfaction, I would acquaint
him,

Advertisemẽt to the Reader concerning the present work.

First, that I have made it my businesse to cast the whole mould and series of the work; that he may find method and order in it, & if at any time through inadvertency or otherwise, he be at losse, and especially if he take not the whole work before him (as I should desire) he may soone have recourse to the Analytical Table, and see in what order that which in present his eye is upon, stands in the whole discourse; If he gaine no advantage by the method into which it is cast, much paines and industry of mine is lost.

Secondly, That I have made it my studie to leave out no piece or part, which may be fairly looked for within this Verge, but have endeavoured to take the whole into consideration, studying to avoid two extreams, the one much prejudicial to the Reader in Treatises of this nature, to give us a bare skeleton of bones and sinewes, leaving their Readers to clothe them with skin and flesh: These serve better to help their memories that are already seen in the subject, then to help those with satisfaction that are not already verst in it, *Memoriæ mater ingenii noverca*. I would learned *Amesius* in his *Medulla Theologiæ Cases of Conscience*, and other learned Works, had not, affecting brevity, herein been defective. Sure I am, the Reader might well wish, that learned *Camero's* work *De triplici Foedere* had by his own hand been more inlarged, & that he had spoken more fully; where his Reader may see cause justly to close with him, and given in his Reasons especially in several differences (which he assigns betweewn the Old (which he calls the subservient Covenant) and the Covenant of Grace, where many suppose they have cause to dissent from him. The other extream might be the Readers benefit, but would have

been

been my burthen, and that is an enlarged full discourse on every particular Divinity head, that may occur in the handling of this Subject, a way which reverend Master *Ball* intended, I have heard it from those that received it from his own mouth, that his purpose was to speak on this Subject of the Covenant, all that he had to say in all the whole body of Divinity; a work that the whole Church might wish (had not Divine providence determined otherwise) that he had enjoyed life to finish. That which he hath left behinde gives us a taste of it, and the advantage the Church might have received by it. I have thought it enough to handle each particular, so as might well answer expectation in reference to the present subject: To speak of Christ as a Mediatour of the Covenant, and to set forth the distinct parts of his work in such mediation without handling the whole of the work, and all the Offices incident to his Mediatorship: To speak of his death ratifying the Covenant of grace, waving the controversie of the extent of it, in the intention of God, or purpose of Christ; It is sufficient to me to assert Faith to be a condition of the Covenant necessary to be put in by us to attain the mercies in the Covenant, to speak of it so far as is here concerned without a large Treatise of the nature, requisites, and life of it; so I may say of godly sorrow, cessation from sin, sincerity of obedience, and the like.

Thirdly, Those particulars relating to this subject, which are most controverted, and in this age disputed, I have spoke to more at large; to instance in some. The conditions of the Covenant of Grace, as well to the *an sint*? whether there be any such conditions at all? which in our times by several hands out of several Principles is denyed; Or the *Quæ sint*? what these conditions be? laying down rules and helps for the better discovery of them. The supposed differences between the old and new, Whether such that offer

fer

ther with my weaknesses, will be a sufficient Apology to hold me back from intermedling in such trifles. And for the Reader that would read for satisfaction, I would acquaint him,

Advertisemẽ s to the Reader concerning the present work.

First, that I have made it my businesse to cast the whole mould and *Series* of the work; that he may find method and order in it, & if at any time through inadvertency or otherwise, he be at losse, and especially if he take not the whole work before him (as I should desire) he may soone have recourse to the Analytical Table, and see in what order that which in present his eye is upon, stands in the whole discourse; If he gaine no advantage by the method into which it is cast, much paines and industry of mine is lost.

Scondly, That I have made it my studie to leave out no piece or part, which may be fairly looked for within this Verge, but have endeavouredto take the whole into consideration, studying to avoid two extreams, the one much prejudicial to the Reader in Treatises of this nature, to give us a bare skeleton of bones and sinewes, leaving their Readers to clothe them with skin and flesh: These serve better to help their memories that are already seen in the subject, then to help those with satisfaction that are not already verst in it, *Memoria mater ingenii noverca*. I would learned *Amesius* in his *Medulla Theologiæ*, *Cases of Conscience*, and other learned Works, had not, affecting brevity, herein been defective. Sure I am, the Reader might well wish, that learned *Camero's* work *De triplici fœdere* had by his own hand been more inlarged, & that he had spoken more fully; where his Reader may see cause justly to close with him, and given in his Reasons especially in several differences (which he assigns betweun the Old (which he calls the subservient Covenant) and the Covenant of Grace, where many suppose they have cause to dissent from him. The other extream might be the Readers benefit, but would have

been

been my burthen, and that is an enlarged full discourse on every particular Divinity-head, that may occur in the handling of this Subject, a way which reverend Master *Ball* intended, I have heard it from those that received it from his own mouth, that his purpose was to speak on this Subject of the Covenant, all that he had to say in all the whole body of Divinity; a work that the whole Church might wish (had not Divine providence determined otherwise) that he had enjoyed life to finish. That which he hath left behinde gives us a taste of it, and the advantage the Church might have received by it. I have thought it enough to handle each particular, so as might well answer expectation in reference to the present subject: To speak of Christ as a Mediatour of the Covenant, and to set forth the distinct parts of his work in such mediation without handling the whole of the work, and all the Offices incident to his Mediatorship: To speak of his death ratifying the Covenant of grace, waving the controversie of the extent of it, in the intention of God, or purpose of Christ; It is sufficient to me to assert Faith to be a condition of the Covenant necessary to be put in by us to attain the mercies in the Covenant, to speak of it so far as is here concerned without a large Treatise of the nature, requisites, and life of it; so I may say of godly sorrow, cessation from sin, sincerity of obedience, and the like.

Thirdly, Those particulars relating to this subject, which are most controverted, and in this age disputed, I have spoke to more at large; to instance in some. The conditions of the Covenant of Grace, as well to the *an sint?* whether there be any such conditions at all? which in our times by several hands out of several Principles is denyed; Or the *Qua sint?* what these conditions be? laying down rules and helps for the better discovery of them. The supposed differences between the old and new, Whether such that offer

fer

fer injurie to the Covenant, under which the Fathers lived, under *Moses* his administration, or before his dayes, making it a meer carnal Covenant, consisting of temporal promises, as the possession of the Land of *Canaan*, and protection there, or at the least a mixt Covenant, and no pure Gospel-Covenant, and the seals suitable? Or such that put too great a limit to the Covenant in Gospel-times vesting it onely in the elect regenerate, excluding all professed ones not yet regenerate, not onely from Covenant-mercies, but all Covenant-terms, not admitting any to stand in any relation to God, but those only whom his Spirit hath changed, making the call of God in the largest sense convertible with Election, and the seal of Baptism to be of no greater latitude (unlesse by mistake mis-applied) than the seal of the Spirit, and determining it in the persons of the elect (about which the meer congregational men and the Antipœdobaptists agreeing in the former, do differ) that they excluding the seed, and leaving them in the same condition (hope of education excepted) with the Heathens: In these and some others, as the Reader may meet withall, I have been more large, in such things where all agree, or where it much skills not, whether we agree or differ (as in what place, whether on earth, or heaven, man had enjoyed immortality in case he had not sinned) what need we to administer matter of contention, our work is to make up breaches (were it possible, so far as it may stand with truth) and not to widen them.

Fourthly, I have not so tied up my self to the expresse immediate doctrine of the covenant, but that I have occasionally drawn Corollaries or Inferences leading to other things of neer relation to, and necessary dependance upon this of the Covenant; I shall not need to give instance, the Reader all along will meet with them, such as I thought would be useful, and to the judicious not ungrateful, some

of

of them practical, that the whole of the Book might not be found to be Polemical, ayming at leaſt at that which the Poet ſo cries up — *Omne tulit punctum, qui miſcuit utile dulci.*

Fifthly, For that part in which *Infant-Baptiſme* and its grounds are particularly vindicated from *Antipædobaptiſts*, the Reader may ſee their arguments and corrupt gloſſes are examined, onely as (according to my method laid down) I have been neceſſitated, and ſo, that the Covenant had not been vindicated according to my duty, in caſe that had been neglected; And here thoſe that pleaſe to heed may ſee, Firſt, the dependance that this Controverſie about *Infant-Baptiſme* hath on the doctrine of the Covenant; that a Scripture Covenant cannot be aſſerted, but Infant-Member-ſhip, Infant-Baptiſme in the latitude, as now generally uſed by Paſtors in their Congregations, muſt be upheld. Secondly, the order in which this controverſie is here carried, may ſo much the rather invite the Reader to it, ſeeing what is in oppoſite Authors laid down ſcatteringly, without regard to any head of doctrine in the Covenant to which it doth relate, here it is reduced to its proper place, and carried on in that manner as an orderly Treatiſe, and not a perſonal conflict; following adverſaries no farther than as they ſtand in the way, to cloud the truth that is there proſecuted; and though many advantages are hereby neglected, that might have been taken, which adverſaries uſe to proſecute to the uttermoſt, and theſe adverſaries would to the height have improved; yet I am very well pleaſed, making it my buſineſſe, that my Reader may not be troubled, but edified. Thirdly, the Scriptures that are produced, and ordinarily agitated in this controverſie of Infant-Baptiſm, are not only urged, but a juſt Analyſis of the context opened, the full ſcope and drift laid down, ſo that it may appeare that the words are not enforced, but

of

of themselves in their native strength commend that doctrine to us; that of *Jerome, Apol. adversus Jovinian* much takes with me, *Commentatoris officium est, non quod ipse velit, sed quid sentiat ille quem interpretatur exponere; Alioqui si contraria dixerit, non tam interpres erit quàm adversarius ejus quem nititur explanare;* And let the impartial and learned judge whether somewhat more cleare light is not here added to their full meaning and the adversaries Sophismes more cleerly detected. Fourthly, The least blow which Mr. *Tombes* received (purposely intended for him) was from Mr. *Baxters* hand, which work contains many irrefragable Arguments to assert Infants Church-Membership, and Baptism from several Scripture-Texts, if not of themselves plain, yet made plain, so that he needs not blush at his Title; but he doth not make it his businesse fully to answer Arguments on the contrary, where he is most full, I have been most brief; where he is most brief, I have been more large; he hath satisfied his Reader, I hope the Reader will say that I have in that part done somewhat for satisfaction of my adversary.

Sixthly, The last part of this Treatise (as the advice on the top of the leaf may signifie) is no more than a new Edition of, with an ample addition to my *Birth-priviledge*, which above my expectation found so good acceptation, onely handling it there Sermon-wise, as fixt on a proper Text, and here by way of Treatise, as a branch of this doctrine of the Covenant, I was put to it in a great part to change the method and texture of it, so that it may rather seem to those that compare them, a new frame, with much borrowed from it, than the same reprinted and enlarged; and there I have endeavoured satisfaction to that which some have said in the way, admitting Infants not according to their Parents-priviledges, but qualification: not as they stand in relation to God, but as they fill up their

relation

relation, which new limit I hope I have discovered to be unwarrantably put, casting those out which the Church (according to the mind of God) from *Abraham* to this time hath received, to the disquiet of our Congregations, and multiplication of our sad, and deplorable differences.

Seventhly, I have made it my businesse to avoid all impertinencies and unnecessary dilatations, being ambitious to speak *multa in paucis*, and not to put the Reader to paines to finde out a little which may serve his purpose in much, affecting brevity so farre as may be without obscurity: In all which, I shall only request two things of the Reader, and both of them such that God himself commands.

A double request made to the Reader.

First, Not to have the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory with respect of persons, that he do not take an estimate of doctrinal points, or controverted opinions, according to the outward garb in which men appear, by reason of any dignity, relation power, or any such circumstance whatsoever; If this once prevail, opinions will be taken up, not according to the strength of truth, that is seen in them, but according to the quality of him that vents them; they will judge of the faith by the men, not of the men by the faith, and upon this account on all hands truth is in danger: And as men in their reputations ebbe and flow, their judgements of things must hold up or fall. Truths sometimes will be cast off, barely on the low repute, and meane condition of such that do deliver them. Though Christ spake as never man spake, and al treasures of wisdome were hid in him, yet it was enough against him that he was a Carpenters son, *Matth.* 13.55. that none of the Pharisees and Rulers beleeved in him, or sided with him, *John* 7.48. A poor man may save a City, and never the lesse his wisdome despised, *Eccles.* 9. 16. sometimes because they are

not men of our intereſts that hold it, they make not up a party for us. The more conſiderable the intereſt is, the greater the hazard (in theſe caſes) truth runnes. *Paul* being brought before a Councel, *Acts* 23. had not a man of whom we can read for him, but all againſt him, for this reaſon, becauſe it did not appear that his opinions ſerved any of their Intereſts; when he obſerved this, and ſaw their Intereſts divided, and that his adverſaries made two parties, he declares himſelf to be for the Intereſt of the one againſt the other, and in point of the Reſurrection to be for the Phariſees againſt the Sadduces, bred up in that way, and ſo perſiſted; hereupon having not a friend before, now he hath many: *There aroſe a great cry, and the Scribes that were of the Phariſees part aroſe, and ſtrove, ſaying, We find no fault in this man, but if a ſpirit, or an Angel hath ſpoken to him, let us not fight againſt God*, Verſe 9. now and not before he muſt be heard. Upon the ſame terms that truth is caſt off, errour is received and taken in, nothing muſt be gainſaid, that men of name, & men of Intereſt will appear to own; yea, relations, kindred, and affections this way gained, are mightily prevalent, to work into Faction and take up Tenents. As diſeaſes many times run in a blood; ſo alſo opinions where they take in a kindred, often very few eſcape. Twenty Sermons, were *Paul*, yea, Jeſus Chriſt in the Pulpit, would not ſo take to ſettle men in the truth, as one poor Letter, or ſimple ſenſeleſſe three-pennie Pamphlet from the hand of a childe, a brother, or ſiſter will work to draw into Errour. I will not here undertake to determine who are meant by children in that ſpeech of our Saviour Chriſt, *Matthew* 12. 27. It appears that it ſpake ſome relation, that drew affections, and therefore whereas Chriſt is cenſured to caſt out Devils by *Beelzebub* the chief of Devils, when any of theſe do ſuch a work, they are cryed up in another manner.

It

It was a true Observation of him that said, *Omnia dicta tanti æstimantur, quantum est ipse qui dixerit, nec tam dictionis vim, atque virtutem, quàm dictatoris cogitent dignitatem.*

The second request of mine is, that men take heed of having mens persons in admiration, because of advantage; we have seen the mischief that respect of persons works, and advantages will work men in the height of it. That way that men can either save themselves from danger, and hold where they are, or rise up to a greater height, the world is apt to take, and the Religion of that side shall be theirs. Hence it is, that when godlinesse ought to be the chiefest gain, gain with these is their whole godlinesse; and state-Religion is almost the faith of every man. Those of that party still cry out for union, not that they will depart the least from the very height of their own principles for it, but they will have all others upon account of their prevalency come into it: so that *self* is no other than their unity paraphrased, and so long as providence holds them up, they are not much mistaken. *Persians* will become Jewes, when *Mordecai* a Jew is the man that rules. *Saul* saw that that was a mighty motive to draw a party in war, to have the gift of vineyards, and oliveyards, to be the fountain of honour, able to make Captaines over thousands, hundreds, fifties. It is no lesse to draw on a party in Religion, as every turne of State respective to Religion is a clear evidence: If these stumble upon truth, they yet hold it upon such carnal motives, that they are neither true to it, nor receive the comfort of it: Make truth then the greatest advantage, there is glory enough in it, without any farther garb to have it in admiration: own it though with a scracht face where you find it; though you be otherwise at losse, it will bring an hundred-fold with it. If I can but gain these things at thy hands, I shall not

of themselves in their native strength commend that doctrine to us; that of *Jerome*, *Apol. adversus Jovinian* much takes with me, *Commentatoris officium est, non quod ipse velit, sed quid sentiat ille quem interpretatur exponere; Alioqui si contraria dixerit, non tam interpres erit quàm adversarius ejus quem nititur explanare*; And let the impartial and learned judge whether somewhat more cleare light is not here added to their full meaning and the adversaries Sophismes more cleerly detected. Fourthly, The least blow which Mr. *Tombes* received (purposely intended for him) was from Mr. *Baxters* hand, which work contains many irrefragable Arguments to assert Infants Church-Membership, and Baptism from several Scripture-Texts, if not of themselves plain, yet made plain, so that he needs not blush at his Title; but he doth not make it his businesse fully to answer Arguments on the contrary, where he is most full, I have been most brief; where he is most brief, I have been more large; he hath satisfied his Reader, I hope the Reader will say that I have in that part done somewhat for satisfaction of my adversary.

Sixthly, The last part of this Treatise (as the advice on the top of the leaf may signifie) is no more than a new Edition of, with an ample addition to my *Birth-priviledge*, which above my expectation found so good acceptation, onely handling it there Sermon-wise, as fixt on a proper Text, and here by way of Treatise, as a branch of this doctrine of the Covenant, I was put to it in a great part to change the methodand texture of it, so that it may rather seem to those that compare them, a new frame, with much borrowed from it, than the same reprinted and enlarged; and there I have endeavoured satisfaction to that which some have laid in the way, admitting Infants not according to their Parents-priviledges, but qualification: not as they stand in relation to God, but as they fill up their

relation

relation, which new limit I hope I have discovered to be unwarrantably put, casting those out which the Church (according to the mind of God) from *Abraham* to this time hath received, to the disquiet of our Congregations, and multiplication of our sad, and deplorable differences.

Seventhly, I have made it my busineſſe to avoid all impertinencies and unneceſſary dilatations, being ambitious to ſpeak *multa in paucis*, and not to put the Reader to paines to finde out a little which may ſerve his purpoſe in much, affecting brevity ſo farre as may be without obſcurity: In all which, I ſhall only requeſt two things of the Reader, and both of them ſuch that God himſelf commands.

A double requeſt made to the Reader.

First, Not to have the faith of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Lord of glory with reſpect of perſons, that he do not take an eſtimate of doctrinal points, or controverted opinions, according to the outward garb in which men appear, by reaſon of any dignity, relation power, or any ſuch circumſtance whatſoever; If this once prevail, opinions will be taken up, not according to the ſtrength of truth, that is ſeen in them, but according to the quality of him that vents them; they will judge of the faith by the men, not of the men by the faith, and upon this account on all hands truth is in danger: And as men in their reputations ebbe and flow, their judgements of things muſt hold up or fall. Truths ſometimes will be caſt off, barely on the low repute, and meane condition of ſuch that do deliver them. Though Chriſt ſpake as never man ſpake, and al treaſures of wiſdome weré hid in him, yet it was enough againſt him that he was a Carpenters ſon, *Matth.* 13. 55. that none of the Phariſees and Rulers beleeved in him, or ſided with him, *John* 7. 48. A poor man may ſave a City, and never the leſſe his wiſdome deſpiſed, *Eccleſ.* 9. 16. ſometimes becauſe they are

not men of our intereſts that hold it, they make not up a party for us. The more conſiderable the intereſt is, the greater the hazard (in theſe caſes) truth runnes. *Paul* being brought before a Councel, *Acts* 23. had not a man of whom we can read for him, but all againſt him, for this reaſon, becauſe it did not appear that his opinions ſerved any of their Intereſts; when he obſerved this, and ſaw their Intereſts divided, and that his adverſaries made two parties, he declares himſelf to be for the Intereſt of the one againſt the other, and in point of the Reſurrection to be for the Phariſees againſt the Sadduces, bred up in that way, and ſo perſiſted; hereupon having not a friend before, now he hath many: *There aroſe a great cry, and the Scribes that were of the Phariſees part aroſe, and ſtrove, ſaying, We find no fault in this man, but if a ſpirit, or an Angel hath ſpoken to him, let us not fight againſt God*, Verſe 9. now and not before he muſt be heard. Upon the ſame terms that truth is caſt off, errour is received and taken in, nothing muſt be gainſaid, that men of name, & men of Intereſt will appear to own; yea, relations, kindred, and affections this way gained, are mightily prevalent, to work into Faction and take up Tenents. As diſeaſes many times run in a blood; ſo alſo opinions where they take in a kindred, often very few eſcape. Twenty Sermons, were *Paul*, yea, Jeſus Chriſt in the Pulpit, would not ſo take to ſettle men in the truth, as one poor Letter, or ſimple ſenſeleſſe three-pennie Pamphlet from the hand of a childe, a brother, or ſiſter will work to draw into Errour. I will not here undertake to determine who are meant by children in that ſpeech of our Saviour Chriſt, *Matthew* 12. 27. It appears that it ſpake ſome relation, that drew affections, and therefore whereas Chriſt is cenſured to caſt out Devils by *Beelzebub* the chief of Devils, when any of theſe do ſuch a work, they are cryed up in another manner.

It

It was a true Obſervation of him that ſaid, *Omnia dicta tanti æſtimantur, quantum eſt ipſe qui dixerit, nec tam dictionis vim, atque virtutem, quàm dictatoris cogitent dignitatem.*

The ſecond requeſt of mine is, that men take heed of having mens perſons in admiration, becauſe of advantage; we have ſeen the miſchief that reſpect of perſons works, and advantages will work men in the height of it. That way that men can either ſave themſelves from danger, and hold where they are, or riſe up to a greater height, the world is apt to take, and the Religion of that ſide ſhall be theirs. Hence it is, that when godlineſſe ought to be the chiefeſt gain, gain with theſe is their whole godlineſſe; and ſtate-Religion is almoſt the faith of every man. Thoſe of that party ſtill cry out for union, not that they will depart the leaſt from the very height of their own principles for it, but they will have all others upon account of their prevalency come into it: ſo that *ſelf* is no other than their unity paraphraſed, and ſo long as providence holds them up, they are not much miſtaken: *Perſians* will become Jewes, when *Mordecai* a Jew is the man that rules. *Saul* ſaw that that was a mighty motive to draw a party in war, to have the gift of vineyards, and oliveyards, to be the fountain of honour, able to make Captaines over thouſands, hundreds, fifties. It is no leſſe to draw on a party in Religion, as every turne of State reſpective to Religion is a clear evidence: If theſe ſtumble upon truth, they yet hold it upon ſuch carnal motives, that they are neither true to it, nor receive the comfort of it: Make truth then the greateſt advantage, there is glory enough in it, without any farther garb to have it in admiration: own it though with a ſcracht face where you find it; though you be otherwiſe at loſſe, it will bring an hundred-fold with it. If I can but gain theſe things at thy hands, I ſhall not

feare that this piece ſhall run the hazzard of thy cenſure, ſpare no errour in it, ſo that thou wilt gladly take up, and reſt ſatisfied in all the truths that thou findeſt. That truth may have the firſt place in thy ſoul, is the deſire and prayers of him that can do nothing againſt, but for the truth,

Thomas Blake

November 27. Imprimatur,

1652 Edm. Calamy.

An

An Advertiſement to the Reader touching this ſecond Edition.

READER,

IT was once the ſad complaint of Reverend *Davenant*, that, *Religionis noſtræ myſteria, quæ ſunt ad parem & ſolatium animarum promulgata, in ſolam penè litigandi & pugnandi materiam vertantur.* The great myſteries of Religion, thoſe pretious Beamings of the Sunne of righteouſneſſe. Which were ſhed abroad, for the begetting of ſpiritual heat, and life in the beleeving heart, were often eclipſed, and their influence much debilitated, through the intervening body of cloudy Controverſies. This way Satan gained upon the Church in its Infancy, which gave occaſion to that good admonition, we have upon record from the bleſſed Apoſtle, Heb. 13. 9. *Be not carryed about with diverſe and ſtrange doctrines, for it is a good thing that the heart be eſtabliſhed with grace*; What theſe *diverſe* and *ſtrange doctrines* were, Interpreters have their different thoughts, which I ſhall wholly wave; the Reader may yet obſerve the Apoſtle hinting at, and tacitely reproving, the proneneſſe that was in men eagerly to purſue, ſtudiouſly to ſweat, and tug about empty notions, whileſt the ſpiritual ſenſe, and feeling of truth in the heart, was little heeded. The ſame Apoſtle traces Satan in the ſame deſign among the *Coloſſians*, Cap. 2. Which puts him upon that pathetical exhortation, Cap. 3. To *ſeek the things that are above*, to lay out their zeal, and centre their affections upon things of a more ſolid, ſublime, and ſpiritual nature, *viz.* the application of Chriſt in the power

Diſſertatio. de morti Chriſti. *Cap.* 1. *pag.*

power of his death, and precious in-comes of his Spirit for the mortification of luſt. What unſpeakable advantage this continued enemy of a beleevers life and comfort hath gained in our age (not to mention the ſpoyles made in the Intervening) our preſent breaches, ſad decays, two fully evidence; yea, ſo fully, that did not a graciory word uphold, and everlaſting armes fix themſelves underneath, our ruines had been uncapable of any further breach. In the midſt of theſe aſtoniſhing providences, and terrible diſpenſations, the Lord (ſuch is his infinite wiſdome, and goodneſſe) hath brought forth meat out of the ſtrong, and honey out of the deſtroyer. Theſe windy ſtormes have through rich grace more deeply rooted ſome, whileſt others have been toſſed to, and fro; theſe Controverſal colliſſions have brought forth much light; thus Satan lyes bleeding under his own weapons. Among other precious treaſures which the Church through mercy doth enjoy, here thou mayeſt ſee truths of the greateſt concernment to beleevers polemically vindicated, practically improved, that mens judgments might be ballanced, and their hearts feel the weight of truth, both which neceſſarily make up a beleevers acquaintance with the truths of *C*hriſt as they are *in him*. The Covenant of grace both in its ſure mercies, and diſtinguiſhing priviledges, is a truth of the greateſt magnitude, appearing rather as a glorious conſtellation, than ſhining with the light of a ſingle ſtarre; It is a rich Cabinet of Diamonds, rather than any ſingle jewel; How far the Reverend Authour (my ever Honoured, and endeared Father) hath been ſerviceable in the hands of Chriſt for the unſealing of this rich Cabinet, the abundant acceptance which this Treatiſe found from men eminently judicious, when it was wrapped up in the ſwadling bands of blurred papers, before it went abroad, doth fully ſpeak. I need not adde thoſe many ſpecial acknowledgments from ſome of the ableſt

pens

pens in the Nation, which after the Authors death were found upon the file in his ſtudy; much might be ſpoken by me, did not my relation to him command a ſilence; the *Lydian* Princes tongue would break no bonds; when violence was offered to his father; give me leave to apply that to the Reverend Author, which ſometimes was obſerved of the *Athenian* Orator, that in his publique diſcourſes, he did not only Βρονταν, but *aculeos in animis auditorum relinquere*; And if I may without envy adde holy *Melanæthons* pythy verſe upon *Luthers* picture, *Fulmina erant linguæ ſingula verba tuæ.* But I ſhall forbear, craving only thy patience, in receiving an account, how far thy gain will be doubled, in this ſecond Edition: In the *firſt*, the Learned Author was neceſſitated to take notice of ſeveral controverſies, which were then ſtarted, theſe afterwards growing more perſonal (& therefore only beautiful in their ſeaſon) are in *this* wholly waved, and truths aſſerted in *Theſi.* In the *firſt*, ſeveral expreſſions (through the natural brevity of the Authours ſtile) were obſcure, and occaſioned the readers ſtumbling, In *this* they receive an additional light, what paſſages might ſeem abſtruſe, now are enlarged. In the *firſt* the method was unavoidably clouded in ſeveral places through digreſſions, and appendices, In *this* each head is digeſted in its proper place. In the *firſt*, ſeveral things were omitted which now upon ſecond thoughts, and deeper wading into the controverſies herein handled, are by the learned Authour in this inſerted; And the whol of this don by the Authors own hand, which he had no ſooner taken off, and ſent it to the Preſſe, but the Lord diſpatched a fiery chariot for him, which took him away to the enjoyment of *Truth* it ſelf; what thou readeſt of him now, was ſealed with his death. They that were acquainted with his ſtate, and frame of ſpirit in that juncture of time when it was finiſhed, muſt needs teſtifie, there was no room for any carnal end to byaſſe, or ſelf-intereſt to

ſteer

ſteer his notions. Reſpective to the doctrine here aſſerted; I ſhall aſſure thee from the mouth of this bleſſed Author, that as he ſweetly laid down his life, in clear, and unſpeakable aſſurance of glory, ſo he dyed without the leaſt Scruple in any of the truths here vindicated. I ſhall no longer entertain thee in the porch, but give thee poſſeſſion of the houſe; Craving only thy Candor in the peruſal of it, orphane children though under the eye and care of endearing friends, yet ſometimes may feel the want of a parental wing, I am not without fears that this Orphane Treatiſe, may complain of ſom Errata's, through the Authors unexpected death, the ſlow progreſſe of the Preſſe, and my great diſtance from it. The God of truth teach thee how to profit, break every ſhell, that thou mayeſt taſte of the kernel, clear up truths to thy apprehenſion, and imprint them upon thy heart, ſo prayes he, who beggs thy prayers for him, becauſe he is

Thine in our Lord Jeſus

Samuel Beresford.

A Scheme

A Scheme of the whole.

This *Treatise* contains
- 1. An *Introduction*.
- 2. The body of the *Treatise*.

The *Introduction* doth contain
- 1. The figurative acceptions of the word, Covenant.
- 2. Requisites in a Covenant, properly so called. *Chap* 1.
- 3. A distribution of Covenants into their several kinds.
- 4 Seven Reasons of Gods dealing with men in a Covenant way.
- 5. The Covenant between God, and man defined.

The body of the *Treatise* contains a distribution of the Covenant into the
- Covenant of Works. *Chap.* 2.
- Covenant of Grace.

The Covenant of Grace is considered,
- 1. In the general nature of a Covenant.
- 2. Joyntly with the Covenant of Works.

1. As considered in the general nature of a Covenant, we may observe
- 1. A Covenant in the proper nature of it between God and fallen man asserted. *Chap.* 3.
- 2. This explained in several propositions.
  - 1. The Covenant of Grace is between God and man, and not between God and Christ. *Chap.* 4.
  - 2. The outward, and not the inward Covenant is a Covenant properly so called,
    - 1. Asserted and argued. *Ch.* 5.
    - 2. Cleared in 6 positions. *Ch.* 6
  - 3. The conditionality of the Covenant of Grace
    - 1. In five arguments proved. *Ch.* 7.
    - 2. Objections answered. *Ch.* 8. *Ch.* 9.
  - 4. God keeps up his soveraignty,
    - 1. In the power and authority of his Law. *Ch.* 10, 11, 12.
    - 2. In exercise of Discipline and correction for sin. *Ch.* 13.

2. Consider joyntly with the Covenant of Works, we see
- 1. Their agreement in eight particulars. *Chap* 14.
- 2. Their differences
  - 1. In the Covenants themselves.
  - 2. In the Conditions annext.

Differences in the Covenants are
- 1. *Primæ.*
  - The Covenant of Works was entered in mans integrity. *Chap.* 15.
  - The Covenant of Grace was entered in mans fallen condition.
- 2. *A primæ orte.*

A Scheme of the whole.

Differences, à primis orta
- The Covenant { of Works was for mans preservation. / of Grace for mans restitution. *Ibid.*
- The Covenant { of Works had its precedency in time. / of Grace followed after. } { Asserted. / Objections answered.
- The Covenant { of Works was of small time in use. / of Grace is of everlasting continuance. *chap.* 16.
- The Covenant { of Works had no Mediatour. { Asserted. / Objections answered. / of Grace was in and by a Mediatour { Asserted. / Works incumbent on the Mediatour held forth.

1. To bring men into a capacity of Covenanting.
2. To bring men within the verge of the Covenant. { 1. By his tender of it. / 2. Shaping the heart for it.
3. To bring the soul up to the termes of the Covenant.
4. To crown those that come up to the terms of it. *chap* 17.

Differences in the conditions.
- 1. Supposed on Gods part. { Death threatned. / Life promised. } The same in both { Asserted. / Objections answered *chap.* 18.
- 2. Real on mans part.

2 Differences asserted.
1. In the Covenant { of Works, the conditions were in mans power. / of Grace, they are not performed without special grace. { Asserted in 6. Reasons. *chap.* 18 / Objections answered. *chap.* 19
2. In the Covenant { of Works, the conditions kept man within himself of righteousnesse. *chap.* 20 / of Grace, the conditions carry man out of himself to be righteous by anothers righteousnesse.
3. In the Covenant { of Works, conditions were for mans preservation. / of Grace, conditions were for mans reparation. *Ibid.*

3. Conditions discovered.
- 1. Serviceable for mans returne to God which is Faith.
  - 1. Explained, the sense of it given, and reasons evincing it. *Chap.* 21
  - 2. In 4. Propositions cleared.
    1. God will not justifie a wicked person.
    2. Man hath no righteousnesse of his own for justification.
    3. Man hath a righteousnesse of grace tendered. *Ibid.*
    4. This righteousnesse is made ours by Faith. { Asserted. / Explained.
      1. Faith in the Sovereignty of God doth not justifie.
      2. Faith justifies as an instrument.
  - 3. Objections answered. *chap* 22. { 1. Asserted. *Ib.* / 2. Object. answ.
  - 4. Corollary drawn, A justified man is fitted for every duty. *Ibid.*

- 2. Serviceable for mans reparation in his qualifications to hold up communiō with God, which is repentance
  - 1. Objections prevented. It is not the same with faith. *Chap.* 23.
  - 2. Duty explained.
    - In the pre-requisite godly sorrow { Asserted in six particulars limited. *Ibid.*
    - In the essentials.
      - *Privative.* Cessation from sinne. *Ibid.*
      - *Positive.* Returne to God.
  - 3. Objections answered.
    - 1. Joyntly against Faith and Repentance. They are mans conditions, not Gods. *chap* 24.
    - 2. Particularly against repentance it self.
      - 1. It is not hereby made a Covenant of Works.
      - 2. Repentance necessarily flowing from Faith, is not thereby disenabled from being a condition in the Covenant of Grace. *Ibid.*
  - 4. Degree of obedience required in our returne.
    - 1. Perfection of degrees not called for of God in Covenant.
    - 2. Covenant of Grace doth not call for perfection, and accept sincerity. { Asserted. / Objections answered.
    - 3. Our Evangelical righteousnesse is imperfect. *Chap.* 25.
    - 4. Covenant of Grace requires and accepts sincerity.

- 1. Necessity of a constant standing Ministery to bring men into Covenant with God, and to bring them up to the termes of it.
  - 1. Explained.
  - 2. Asserted.
    - 1. In seven reasons evincing that such a Ministery is established.
    - 2. In reasons evincing such a Ministery to be thus established.
  - 3. Objections answered.
    - *Joel* 2. 28, 29. Vindicated. *cb.*26
    - *Jer.* 31. 31. &c. Vindicated.

4. Corollaries.

4. Corollaries drawn.

- 2. Schooles and Nurseries of learning in order to a gifted Ministery.
  - Asserted. *Chap.* 27.
  - Objections answered.
- 3. Orderly way of admission of men into a Ministerial function necessary.
  - 1. Asserted by several reasons. *Chap.* 28.
  - 2. Explained by distinguishing of Callings.
  - 3. Ordination defined, in the parts of it explained.
- 4. Ministers of Christ must bring their people up to the termes of the Covenant.
  - 1. Explained.
  - 2. Asserted. *Chap.* 29.
  - Objections answered.
- 5. People in Covenant must come up to the termes of the Covenant. *Chap.* 30.

The Covenant of Grace is either the Old or New Covenant.

In which observe
- 1. Agreement in 6 particulars. *Chap.* 31.
- 2. Differences. *Chap.* 32.

Differences.
- 1. Real in six particulars.
- 2. Supposed or imaginary.
  - Nine Positions premised for a right understanding of the Old Covenant. *Chap.* 33.
  - Differences themselves assigned.

Differences assigned are
- 1. Laying the Old Covenant too low.
- 2. Putting too great a restraint on the New.

I. Laying

- I. Laying the Old Covenant too low.
  - 1. Supposing it to consist of meere carnal promises,
    - 1. Interests to which this drives.
      - *Popish.*
      - *Socinian.*
      - *Antipædobaptistical.* *chap.* 34.
    - 2. Contrary asserted, and the spiritualty of the Old Covenant maintained.
  - 2. Supposing it to be a mixt and no pure Gospel-Covenant. *Chap.* 35.
    - 1. Meaning enquired into.
    - 2. Grounds.
      - Examined,
      - Enervated.
- II. Putting too great a restraint on the New Covenant.
  - 1. Limitting it alone to the Regenerate.
    - 1. To which something is spoke.
      - 1. By way of concession, that sundry Divines seeme to speak to that purpose.
      - 2. By way of Avoidance, from their owne words.
    - 2. Contrary asserted.
      - 1. In Old Testament-times.
        - 1. By confession of the adversarie. } 36
        - 2. By Scripture-testimony. }
      - 2. In New Testament times.
        - 1. by New Testament-Scriptures
          - *Mat.* 28. 19
          - *Mat.* 22. 24
          - *Heb.* 10. 29
          - 1 *Pet.* 2. 9
          - } 37
        - 2. By Arguments of sundry sorts. *ch.* 38
        - 3. Objections answered. *ch.* 39
        - 4. Corollaries drawn.
  - 1. Professed Beleevers are under a Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works. *chap.* 40
  - 2. Interest in a Church state, is of equal latiude with the Covenant. *c.* 41
  - 3. Such Covenant-interest is sufficient to give accesse to, and interest in particular visible Churches. *chap.* 42
  - 4. Dogmatical Faith entitles to Baptisme. *chap* 43
  - 5. Impenitence and unbelief in professed Christians is a breach of Covenant. *chap.* 44

Five

- Five Positions concerning particular Churches
  1. Where nothiug is wanting to the being of a Church, yet much may be wanting for the wel-ordering.
  2. A people in a vicinity ought to associate themselves.
  3. Professing Christians upon tender, ought to be received.
  4. Reformation of abuses is the work of Christians, rather than separation.
     7. Rules concerning separation.
  5. Together Churches out of Churches unwarrantable.
- 2. Terminating it onely in the person actually entring & excluding the issue, in which
  1. Question stated as to *Abrahams* natural issue — *Chap.* 45
  2. Arguments concluding the natural issue of *Abraham* to be in Covenant. — *Chap.* 46
  3. New-Testament Testimonies evincing it. — *Ibid.*
  4. Objections from *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. answered. — *Chap.* 47
  5. The extent of it to the issue of Beleevers in New-Testament times. — *Chap* 48
     1. Asserted.
     2. Proved.
  - 1. By Scripture testimonies
    - *Rom.* 11. 16. *Chap.* 49. & 50
    - 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Chap.* 51
    - *Galat.* 4. 29 *Chap.* 52.
    - *Matth* 19. 14. / *Marke* 10 14 / *Luke* 18. 16. — *Chap.* 53
  - 2. By several arguments. — *Chap.* 54.
  6. Corollary for Infant-Baptisme. — *Chap.* 55
     1. By Arguments asserted, objections answered.
     2. The reality of connexion between the Covenant and the Seal vindicated. — *Chap* 56
     3. Sin of Sacriledge upon the repulse charged. — *Ch.* 57
     4. The title of all infants of professing parents asserted. — *Chap.* 58
  7. Practical uses concerning parent and issue inferred. — *Ch* 60
     1. All possible engagements to holinesse of life. — *Ibid.*
     2. Parents must see that their childrens breeding answer their birth.
     3. There is great danger in opposing Gods Covenant-people
     4. Consolation from this Birth-priviledge,
        1. In reference to Nations.
        2. In reference to single persons.
           1. Themselves.
           2. Their posterity.

The Analytical Table being chiefly intended for, and suited to learned capacities, the vulgar Reader may here see the whole of the following Treatise, as it is digested into Chapters, and these easily found by the pages opposite to them.

Chap. 1. *AN Introduction into the whole.* page 1

2. *The Covenant of God entred with mankinde distinguished.* 8

3. *A Covenant between God and fallen man in the proper nature of it asserted.* 10

4. *The Covenant of grace is between God and man, and not between God and Christ.* 13

5. *The Outward, and not the Inward Covenant, is a Covenant, properly so called.* 19

6. *Six positions tending to clear the thing in question.* 24

7. *The Covenant of Grace calls for conditions from man.* 33

8. *A grand Objection against this Doctrine answered.* 36

9. *Further Objections against the former Doctrine answered.* 48

10. *God in the dayes of the Gospel, keeps up the power and authority of his Law. The obligation of it is still inforce, to bind the consciences of Beleevers.* 53

11. *The Moral Law is a perfect rule of righteousnesse.* 62

12. *The Moral Law bindes as it was delivered by the hand of* Moses. 73

13. *God entring a Covenant of Grace with his people, keeps up his Soveraignty in exercise of Discipline, in the correction*

rection and chastisement of his people for sinne. 77
14. Agreement between the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace. 86
15. Differences between the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace. 87
16. A further difference between the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace. 91
17. Works incumbent upon the Mediatour of the Covenant of Grace. 93
18. Further differences between the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace. 99
19. Objections against the former Doctrine answered. 113
20. Further differences in the conditions in the Covenant of Works, and the conditions in the Covenant of Grace. 115
21. Faith is a condition of the Covenant of Grace. 118
22. Objections against the conditionality of Faith answered. 130
23. Repentance is a condition of the Covenant of Grace. 136
24. Objections against the conditionality of repentance answered. 144
25. What degree of obedience, the Covenant of Grace calls for from Christians. 148
26. The necessity of a Ministry to bring men into Covenant with God, and to bring them up to the termes of it. 160
27. Schooles, and Nurseries of learning, in order to a gifted Ministry necessary. 173
28. An orderly way of admission of men into the Ministerial function, necessary. 180
29. Ministers of Christ must bring their people up to the termes of the Covenant, pressing the necessity of faith and repentance. 188
30. A people in Covenant must come up to the termes of the Covenant, being engaged to God they must answer their engagements. 190

31. The

31. *The distribution of the Covenant of Grace into the Old, and New Covenant, with the harmony and agreement, that is found between them.* 202
32. *Differences assigned between the Old and New Covenant.* 205
33. *Positions tending to clear the first Covenant, under Old Testament-dispensations.* 210
34. *The Old Covenant was not made up of meer carnal promises, but contained New Covenant-promises, that were spiritual and saving.* 219
35. *The Old Covenant was a pure Gospel Covenant, and not mixt.* 224
36. *The Covenant of Grace, admits Christians in Gospel-times in a state of unregeneration, and is not limited in the bounds of it to the elect regenerate.* 231
37. *New Testament-Scriptures asserting the latitude of the Covenant of Grace in Gospel times.* 235
38. *Arguments evincing the Covenant of Grace in Gospel-times in that latitude as before is asserted.* 248
39. *Objections against this latitude of the Covenant answered.* 257
40. *Professed beleevers are under a Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works.* 262
41. *Interest in a Church-state is of equal latitude with the Covenant.* 267
42. *A man in Covenant with God, and recieved into the universal Church visible, needs no more to give him accesse to, and interest in particular visible Churches.* 270
43. *A dogmatical faith entitles to Baptisme.* 289
44. *Impenitence and unbelief in professed Christians is a breach of Covenant.* 294
45. *The question stated concerning the birth-priviledge of the issue of beleevers.* 295
46. *Arguments concluding the natural issue of* Abraham,

Isaac, *and* Jacob, *to be taken into Covenant.* 301
47. Rom. Chap. 9. Verse 6. 7, 8, *vindicated.* 309
48. *The Covenant in New Testament-times takes in parents, with their children.* 316
49. Rom. 11. 16. *vindicated.* 323
50. *Arguments from a late hand for ingraffing into the Church invisible, and breaking off from it, answered.* 330
51. 1 Corinth. 7. 14. *vindicated.* 349
52. Galat. 4. 29. *vindicated.* 366
53. Mat. 19. 14 Mark. 10. 14. Luke 18. 16. *vindicated* 393
54. *Reasons evincing the birth-priviledge and covenant-holinesse of Believers and their issue.* 401
55. *A Corollary for Infant-Baptisme.* } 410
Infant-baptisme by arguments asserted. }
56. *The reality of connexion, between the Covenant and initial seal, asserted.* 422
57. *The with-holding Infants of Christian parents from baptisme, is the sin of Sacriledge.* 437
58. *The children of all that are Christians in profession, are by vertue of Covenant-interest, to be recieved into the Church by baptisme.* 448
59. *A defence of the former Doctrine respective to the latitude of Infant-Baptisme.* 468, 458
60. *The application of the whole in several inferences.* 478

THE

A TREATISE OF THE Covenant OF WORKS, AND OF THE Covenant OF GRACE.

CHAP. I.

An Introduction into the whole.

I Shall not make it my buſineſſe, for an Introduction into this Work, to enquire after the derivation of the word. Etymologies are known to be no definitions; The denomination being uſually given, from ſome adjuncts, variable, according to times & places, and not from any thing that is of the eſſence of that which is enquired after, in which thoſe that are higheſt in Criticiſmes, in giving their judgements of them, can yet ordinarily go no higher then conjecture; The common acception of the

word in Scripture, is that which will give the greateſt light, in finding out the nature of Scripture covenants, which as moſt other words is variouſly uſed. Sometimes it is uſed *Properly*, implying a covenant in deed and truth, ſtrictly ſo called, and containing all the requiſites of a Covenant in it. Sometimes *Tropically*, for that which contains ſome parts and adjuncts of a covenant, and ſo carries ſome reſemblance to, and ſtands in ſome affinity with it. This Tropical figurative, and the native proper ſenſe muſt be carefully diſtinguiſhed, and may by no meanes be confounded, by thoſe that will underſtand the true nature of a covenant, and avoid thoſe manifold miſtakes, into which ſome upon this a lone account have been carried: The figurative acceptions of the word, are diverſe, ſometimes the homage required, or duty covenanted for, is called a covenant by way of Synechdoche, ſeeing a covenant between a Superiour and Inferiour doth comprize it, ſo *Jerem.* 34.13. *I made a Covenant with your fathers, in the day that I brought them out of the Land of Egypt*, which Covenant is no other then the Law that he gave them, *Exod.* 21.2. Sometimes the promiſe annext, is called by the name of a covenant, by a like Synechdoche, Gen. 17. 7. *I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations for an everlaſting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee*, *Gen.* 9 11. Sometimes the Seal is called by the name of a Covenant, by way of Metonymy of the adjunct, ſerving to ratifie and confirme a covenant, *Gen.* 17.10. *This is my covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, every man-childe among you ſhall be circumciſed.* Sometimes Chriſt the Mediatour of the covenant is called by a like figure, the covenant, *Iſa.* 42 6,7. *I will give thee for a covenant of the people, and light unto the Gentiles.* Sometimes the Lord Chriſts undertaking, to work the graces covenanted for, in the hearts of his people, in the way of his power, exerted in the converſion of ſinners, is called by the name of a covenant, *Jerem.* 31.33. *This is the covenant that I will make with the whole houſe of Iſrael, after thoſe dayes, ſaith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts*; of which more in its own place Sometimes a covenant is taken for that peace, which uſually followes upon covenants, *Job* 5. 23. *Thou ſhalt be in league with the ſtones of the field, and the beaſts of the field ſhall be*

Figurative acceptions of the word Covenant.

be at peace with thee, Hos. 2. 18. *In that day I will make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowles of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground; and I will break the bowe, and the sword, and the battel out of the earth, and will make them to lie down safely.* When yet neither a Law, nor a Promise, nor Seal annext, nor yet the Mediatour, or any undertaking of his, can be a covenant properly so called. A Law from God with a Promise annext, assented to by man, is a covenant; and when a Seal is added, there is a condescension to our weakness, for the more abundant ratification and confirmation of Gods stability in his Promises. In our enquiry after such covenants, which God in his gracious condescension is pleased to enter with man the general nature of a covenant must be held, every *Species* must partake of its *Genus*; We must not make Gods covenant with man, so farre to differ, from covenants between man and man, as to make it no covenant at all; we must also observe that which differences it from covenants meerly humane, that covenants divine and humane be not confounded together. In order to which we must know that in every covenant properly so called, these requisites must concur.

Requisites in a Covenant.

First, it must not be of one alone, but at least of two parties, one can make no bargain or agreement. Secondly, there must be a mutual consent of these parties. When *Nahash* the Ammonite, offered to make a Covenant with *Israel*, on condition that he might thrust out all their right eyes, 1 *Sam.* 11. 2. the Israelites refusing and running the hazard of a fight, rather then undergo it, here was no covenant. Thirdly, each party must engage themselves one to another, for performance of somewhat covenanted for, whether debt, duty, or promise. When *Abraham* agreed with the Hittites for a burial place for foure hundred Shekels, *Gen.* 23. 15, 16. There was a covenant properly so called, having apparently in it all requisites of a covenant. So also in *Jeremies* purchase, *Jer.* 32. 10 and the Levites hiring of himselfe to do the office of a Priest, *Judg.* 17. 10. *Micah* and he mutually agree, he is to do the office of a Priest, and *Micah* is to pay his covenant-wages; so that he hit right of the nature of a covenant, that defined it to be *A mutual agreement between parties upon Articles or Propositions on both sides, so that each partie is tied and bound to perform his own conditions.* This holds forth the general

neral nature of a covenant, and is common to all covenants, publick and private, divine or humane, differencing it first from a Law or Precept, where there is a command out of sovereignty propounded, without any obligation or engagement on the Lawgiver or Commander. Secondly, from a single promise, where there is a signification of the will of him that makes the promise, touching some good to him to whom the promise is made, without any restipulation from him; And to let passe several Divisions of covenants, little pertinent to our purpose (which may be seen in Civilians and Politians, particularly in *Grotius lib. 2. De Jure Belli & Pacis, cap. 15.*) and to speak to such, which may give some light to the present work. Covenancs of this nature properly so called, are either between equals, where either party may indifferently indent with other, neither standing engaged to other, otherwise then by covenant, as in the instances before mentioned. The Priest was not engaged to officiate for *Micah*, nor *Micah* to give money or rayment to the Priest, but by vertue of contract, one was the others equal, in regard of any dependance one upon the other. Or else they are between Superiour and Inferiour, the Superiour condescending to the Inferiour, to deale by way of covenant, when yet the whole that is required by him, is of debt, and might without agreement or stipulation be required and exacted. This superiority and inferiority, is either mixt and imperfect, or else it is absolute and sovereigne: Mixt and imperfect superiority, and inferiority, is, between parent and childe, master and servant, equal in being, but Superiour and Inferiour in relation; Of this nature was that of *Isaac* with *Esau*, Gen. 27. 34. *Take I pray thee thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bowe, and go out to the field to take me some venison, and make me savoury meat, such as I love, that my soul may blesse thee before I die*; *Esau* was tied as a childe to do what *Isaac* required, though he had hinted or promised no blessing; Superiority and Inferiority, absolute and sovereigne, is only between God and his creature, no other is an absolute Superiour; and such is the covenant, when God enters covenant. It is of sovereignty that God makes a Law; It is of condescension and goodnesse that he enters covenant, in which man may not indent, but must accept; professedly accepting, and in sincerity of heart performing, what God in covenant demands; yet it is a cove-

Distinctions of Covenants.

covenant, and properly so called, that he enters with his creature, especially that which he enters with mankind, having all the ingredients, and fore-named requisites of a covenant, as in the sequel (God willing) shall be demonstrated. God is engaged to retribution, and man to fealty, and either of both by consent. Covenants between any parties, whether Superiour and Inferiour, or equals among themselves, are either simply and nakedly such without any farther solemnity, or ceremony, or any thing more then is essentially necessary in a Covenant, a mutual engagement between each other on such termes and propositions as are mutually agreed. Or else they are covenants with addition of ceremonies, solemnities, wayes of ratification and confirmation; as instances might be given in covenants, both humane and divine; As the committing the words of the Covenant to writing, *Jer.* 32. 10. Calling in witnesses, in the same place, and *Ruth* 4. 10, 11. giving of the hand, making oath, *Ezek.* 17. 18. or any other National custome in use, for confirmation, as the setting up of a stone, *Joshuah* 24. 26, 27. the division of a Calf, and passage between the parts of it, *Jerem.* 34. 18. laying upon themselves by way of imprecation, such a judgement that then befel that beast, in case of falsification, so that some making definition of a covenant, over and above what is essential, make addition of such wayes of ratification; so *Ravanellus* defines a Covenant to be, *A mutual agreement of two parties, in which either ties himself to other upon certain conditions in the use of some outward signes and tokens, for attestation and confirmation, that the promise may be inviolable.* The covenant which God pleases to enter with man, especially with fallen man, under which we are, and our fathers in old Testament-administrations were, is not a bare naked covenant, but in the highest way of solemnity, committed to writing, *John* 20. 31. confirmed by witnesses with miracles, *Heb.* 2. 4. by oath, *Heb.* 6. 13. 17. by seals, *Matth.* 28. 19. *Matth.* 26. 28. compared with *Rom.* 4. 11. And when he might have dealt with man, by way of sovereignty, ruling solely by prerogative and command, not letting man know any reward for his service, or at all to have understood the issue and event;

Mutua pactio duarum partium, qui altera alteri se certis conditionibus obligat ad aliquid faciendum, dandum aut accipiendum adhibitis signis & Symbolis externis, ad solennem testificationem confirmationis causâ, ut promissio sit inviolabilis. Sic & Ursinus.

vent; yet he is pleased to wave such right, and to deal by way of covenant, and that in this way here mentioned.

Reasons why God deals with man in a Covenant-way.

First, That his people might be willing in the day of his power, *Psalme* 110. 3. Obedience extorted, contributes not that honour to him, whom we obey, we confesse a necessity in our selves to yeeld, but scarce acknowledge any worth in such a Superiour to command; serving no otherwise then *Israel* did *Pharaoh*, as a bond-man serves his master, one volunteer that goes out of choice, more honours an expedition, then ten that are prest by power for service, only waiting an opportunity by stealth, out of dislike, as *Davids* souldiers out of shame, to quit the service, 1 *Sam.* 19. 3.

Secondly, to vanquish all temptations, and overcome all assaults that may occurre in mans way of obedience; *Adam* in innocency was foiled by a temptation, which he had overcome, in case he had heeded the terms of the covenant, the curse that was threatened, and the promise that was contained in it; man in his fallen estate undergoes many tryals, and is encountered with variety of temptations, had he not a word on which he might hope, a word of promise in way of covenant from God, he could not stand, but of necessity must perish.

Thirdly, that love rather then fear might principle man in his obedience, as seeing more of goodnesse to induce, then of wrath to scare him into it; God will have his servants, sons. The free honour of a childe to his father, rather then the compulsory fear of a servant, pleases him.

Fourthly, for the aggravation of sinne; The more of condescension, goodnesse, bounty, and love appears, in Gods way of dealing; the more of equity is seen, and the more ingratitude and folly appears in mans disobedience.

Fifthly, for mans greater consolation; An up-right-hearted man findes abundance of peace, in his covenant entered with God; when he prayes and seeks the greatest mercy in prayer, he is able to say, *In thy faithfulnesse answer me, and in thy righteousnesse*, Psal. 143. 1. *Paul* can say, that *God the righteous Judge shall give him a Crown of righteousnesse*, 2 Tim. 4. 8. Having engaged by covenant, righteousnesse ties him to make good his engagements; This is Gods end, in his entrance of covenant, and ratification of it by oath, consequently, in committing it to writing,

and

d confirming it by ſeal; *That by two immuntable things in which was impoſſible for God to lie, we might have a ſtrong conſolation, ho have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope ſet before us*, Heb. 18. Theſe ſtrong conſolations were the end of God, in rati-ing his Covenant, They are the ſupport, and Spirit reviving cor-ls to his people in Covenant; See the reſult of the Pſalmiſts editations, *In the multitude of my thoughts within me, thy nforts delight my ſoul*, Pſalme 94. 19. *I will both lay me down in ce and ſleep, for thou, Lord, only makeſt me dwell in ſafety*, Pſalme 8. *The Lord is my light and my ſalvation, whom ſhall I feare? he Lord is the ſtrength of my life, of whom ſhall I be afraid?* Pſal. 1.

Sixthly, for the greater terrour of the adverſaries of his peo-, when they ſee themſelves engaged againſt them, and God nds in a covenant unviolable engaged for them; when they , that their work is to ruinate and deſtroy him that God will e. Hence it is while their Rock ſells them not, one of them aſes a thouſand, and two put ten thouſand to flight, *Deut.* 32. 0. *Paul* in bonds can make *Felix* tremble on his Throne, *Acts* . 25. *Hamans* wiſe-men, and *Zereſh* his wife ſpake words of rrour, upon experiment made, *If Mordecai be of the ſeed of the ws, before whom thou haſt begun to fall, thou ſhalt not vaile againſt him, but ſhalt ſurely fall before him*, Eſter 13.

Seventhly, the Lord hereby puts a name, and an honour upon his ople. *David* took it to be an honour to be related to *Saul*, nd, ſo to become the ſonne of a King, much more then, is it an onour to be brought into this relation to God. This honour ave all the Saints, and they are taken into covenant for honour ke, *The Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar peo-le, as he hath promiſed thee, and that thou ſhouldeſt keep all his ommandments; and to make thee high above all Nations which he ath made, in praiſe, and in honour, and that thou mayeſt be an holy ople to the Lord thy God*, Deut. 26. 18, 19. They are, the portion, e inheritance, the children, the eſpouſed ones, and whatſo-er elſe that ſpeaks a neer relation is theirs.

This was Gods way of dealing (I doubt not) with the Angels hough (we being not intereſted in it) there is no neceſſity that t ſhould be written for our learning: Sure we are, it was his way

of

of dealing with man as well before his fall, (as presently shall be shewn) as out of more abundant grace and condescension for his restitution. And not mentioning for present any more, then that which is essential in the covenant, of God with man, I suppose it may be thus held out to us: *A mutual compact or agreement between God and man upon just and equal termes prescribed by himself, in which God promises true happinesse to man, and man engages himself by promise for performance of what God requires.* This description here laid down, comprizes the way of God, in every one of his covenants with man, both before and after his fall, under Old and New Testament-revelations, all that is essential in any covenant that he enters; Equals covenanting do either of them article and indent, but God condescending to a covenant, man must not article, but must assent, and engage for performance of what is prescribed, otherwise it will bear the nature of a Law, but not of a Covenant. It is true, all men are bound upon tender from God, to accept; It was the sin of Jewish and heathenish people, to stand out whensoever the Gospel was preached; but they were no covenant-people till they gave their assent, and then they were received as a covenant-people, and baptized. Exceptions cannot be taken against, or challenge made of this definition of covenants in general, nor of the covenant which God in particular entereth with man; and these standing, they will give us light, and afford us singular help for a right understanding of the covenant of God, entered with man in the several species, and distinct wayes of administration of it.

The Covenant between God and Man defined.

CHAP. II.

The Covenant of God entered with mankinde, distinguished.

THere is a two-fold covenant, which God out of his gracious condescension, hath vouchsafed to enter with man. The first immediately upon the creation of man, when man yet stood right in his eye, and bore his image, the alone creature on earth, that

hat was in a capacity to enter covenant. We have not indeed he word covenant, till after man was fallen, nor yet in any place f Scripture, in reference to the transactions past between God nd man, in his state of integrity, neither have we such expressions hat fully and explicitely hold out a covenant to us; but we finde implied, and so much expressed, from whence a covenant with he conditions of it is evinced. That Law, with the penalty annext, given to our first parents, (*Gen.* 2.17. *Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day that thou eatest, thou shalt surely die;*) plainly implies in it, a covenant entred; man was in present possession of life (that is according to Scripture-phrase, happinesse) in his whole person full and compleat according to his present capacity, This is to be continued (as is there evidently implied) till sinne dispossesse him of it; Till he sin he shall not die; As long as he persists in his integrity, his life is to be continued, of which the Tree of Life (as is not to be doubted) was a Sacrament. The second, God was pleased to enter with man upon his fall, which was a covenant of reconciliation, the most unhappy variance between earth and heaven having intervened. The former, is, usually called a *covenant of Works*, the latter, is, called a *covenant of Grace*, though indeed, the fountain, and first rise of either, was the free grace, and favour of God. For howsoever the first covenant was on condition of obedience, and engaged to the reward of Works, yet it was of Grace, that God made any such promise, of reward to any work of man, when man had done all (even in that estate) which was commanded, he was still an unprofitable servant, he had done no more then duty, and no emolument did thence accrew to his Maker. It was enough that he was upheld, and sustained of God in the work, to live in him, and upon him, when the work was done he might have been justly annihilated. If merit be taken in a proper sense, *Adam* in innocency was too low for it, all his work being but homage due, no profit redounding to God, and the work bearing no proportion to the reward. But a more superabundant measure of Grace is seen in Gods entrance into covenant with man in his fallen condition, and infinitely more favor is shewn in his reconciliation, then in his preservation Therefore this by way of eminency hath the honour to be stiled the covenant of Grace, the other retaines the name of the covenant of Works.

God entered Covenant with man in his estate of integrity.

Grace is the fountain and first rise of every Covenant of God with man.

These two bearing these denominations have their respective agreement, and differences, which are to be enquired into: but before I reach those, it is necessary that somewhat be spoken to assert a covenant of grace, in Gospel-times, and to give us some further light for a right understanding of it.

CHAP. III.

A Covenant in the proper nature of it, between God, and fallen man, asserted.

BEfore I proceed any further in this work; one great rub that lies in the way, is to be removed, otherwise, not only, all that which I have said; but also, all that which I shall speak on this subject, will fall to the ground, and that is their objection that say, that God hath not entred any covenant, properly so called, with fallen man. He hath by way of Sovereignty, laid commands upon man; Of free grace hath made rich and large promises, by way of legacy bequeathed life and salvation to him, but hath entred no covenant properly so called (as these say) with him, which is purposely done to avoid those conditions, which are assertedin this covenant. If this stand, the division before laid down; of a Covenant into a Covenant of Works, and a Covenant of Grace necessarily falls, such a division must not be suffered, where any one member of the division is not; If therefore there be no covenant of God with fallen man, nor no such thing as the covenant of Grace, there can be no such division of the covenant, and all agreement or differences assigned; will be between an entity, and a non-entity; between that which hath a reality, and a meer Chimæra. A covenant therefore in the proper nature of it, is to be asserted. and the speediest way to make this good, is to prove from Scripture the name and the thing, that the word *Covenant* is there; and the thing, in the proper nature of it, which the words hold out; and all of this respective to the transactions between God and fallen man. The word we finde in places without number, it were a needlesse labour to give instances, when every Reader is able to furnish himself with such

such multitudes. But when this cannot be denyed, the impropriety of the speech is objected. It is called by the name of a Covenant (as is said) when in strict propriety of speech, it is no covenant; But to avoid this, the thing it self may be as easily proved as the word, and when we have *nomen*, and *nominis ratio-nem*, then we have a covenant, not equivocally nor yet analogically, but properly so called. And here I may deal liberally with any adversary, and undertake to make proof, not only of all the essentials of such a covenant in Scripture, but the usual adjuncts, not onely of all, that makes up the nature, but all accessories usually added to the solemnity of covenants. The essentials or real properties of a covenant, are contained in the usual definitions which afterwards we shall see laid down from several hands, all of which are in short comprised in these words, *A mutual consent of parties with stipulation on both sides.* Parties, consent, and mutual engagement is all that is required to the same being of a covenant; when two parties agree, and either of them both, have their conditions to make good, there is a covenant or bargaine; see it exemplified in several instances given, *Chap.* 1. All of these we finde in that one place, *Deut.* 26. 17, 18, 19. in the covenant that God enters with his people, *Thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, and to walk in his wayes, and to keep his Statutes, and his Commandments, and his Judgements, and to hearken to his voice: And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep all his Commandments; And to make thee high above all Nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be an holy people unto the Lord thy God, as he hath spoken.* There are the Covenanters, *God* and *his people*; There is consent on both parties, *Thou hast avouched, the Lord hath avouched*; And there is a *stipulation* on both sides; On Gods part, *To make them high above all Nations, which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour*: On the peoples part, *To keep all his Commandments, to be an holy people.* There are covenant-mercies from God to his people, unto which of grace he engages himself; and there are covenant-duties unto which man stands engaged, *Psal.* 103. 17, 18. *But the mercie of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that fear him, and his righteousnesse unto childrens children; to such as*

keep his Covenant, and to those that remember his Commandments.

In the usual accessories on solemnities.

The usual solemnities of a covenant, are also found, in the transactions between God and his people, as well as the essentials of it. 1. Covenants used to be written, for memorial for posterity, and so is the covenant, between God and man, as in Old, so in New Testament-times. *These things are written that you might believe, and that believing you may have everlasting life*, John 20. 31. 2. Covenants used to be confirmed with *outward visible signes*, as the killing of beasts, *Gen.* 15 *Jer.* 34. this was done in the old administration, *Exod.* 24. Half of the blood was sprinkled upon the Altar, to denote Gods entering of Covenant, *vers.* 6. The people also were sprinkled with blood, to shew their voluntary entring into covenant, *vers.* 8. And in the new dispensation, a new and unheard of ratification was used, the blood of the Mediatour of the Covenant, *Matth.* 26. 27, 28. *This Cup is my blood in the New Testament, which was shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins.* This latter is a plain allusion to the former, in which you may finde. 1. A threefold agreement. Either of both these were covenants. 2. Either of both these, had their ratifications and confirmations. 3. Either of both were confirmed with blood. 2. A threefold difference. 1. The former was the Old covenant, which was antiquated, This is the New. 2. The former was ratified, and sanctified with the blood of beasts: This is ratified and sanctified, in the blood of Christ. 3. That blood could never take away sin, *Heb.* 10. This was shed for many, for remission of sins.

Thirdly, covenants use to be confirmed by *seal*: so, is, this covenant, between God and his people, which is to be spoken to elsewhere.

Arguments evincing a Covenant in the proper nature of it.

As the being of a covenant is thus plentifully proved by Scripture-testimony; so we might as amply prove it by arguments drawn from thence. The Churches of Christ are espoused unto Christ, *Hos.* 2. 19, 20. *And I will betroth thee unto me for ever, yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousnesse, and in judgement, and in loving kindnesse, and in mercies; I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulnesse, and thou shalt know the Lord.* 2 Cor. 11. 2. *I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you to Christ*; and Spouses are in covenant with their

Bride-

Bridegroom. The Churches of Christ are married to Christ: *Isa.* 54. 5. *Thy Maker is thine Husband, the Lord of hosts is his Name, and thy Redeemer the holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall he be called.* And wives are in covenant with their husbands. Their sinnes against God are branded with the names of Adulteries, Whoredomes; and these are not barely dis-obedience of a Command, or neglect of a favour, but breaches of covenant. The Churches of Christ are servants of Christ, *Levit.* 25. houshold servants, *Ephes.* 2. 19. and servants are their Masters by covenant. Their sinnes in this relation are not barely obstinacy, stubbornness, or ingratitude, but they are charged with treachery, falsehood, dealing falsely in covenant, and their hearts being not stedfast in covenant. It is above me to conceive, how man can be a covenant-breaker, (not alone respective to man, but God, as he is frequently charged) when there hath past no covenant between God and him. They may question, whether there were ever any such thing, as a covenant in the world, that deny this to be a covenant, in the proper nature of it; some objections raised in their due place will be answered.

CHAP. IV.

The Covenant of Grace is between God and man; and not between God and Christ.

HAving asserted a covenant in the proper nature of it, it is necessary, before I proceed further on, to give differences between this covenant of Works, and the covenant of Grace, to speak something by way of Explication, covenant being taken in so various and ambiguous senses, or at least so many senses put upon it, which I take to be a misunderstanding of the Scripture-covenant, I shall lay down certaine Explicatory Propositions for clearing of the thing in question. And the leading on shall be this. *The Covenant of grace is between God and man, between God, and those of fallen mankinde, that he pleases to take into covenant, God and man are the two parties in the covenant; It is not made between God and Christ.* This is so plain, that a man might think there

there needed no words about it, but that there are ſome that will have man to be no party in it, and that it is entred onely with Chriſt on behalf of thoſe that God hath choſen in Chriſt to himſelf. To this I ſhall ſpeak firſt by way of conceſſion, yeelding to them of this opinion, theſe three things that follow. 1. That there
13. is ſuch a covenant of which they ſpeak, which was entred between God and Chriſt, containing the tranſactions which paſſe between the Father and the Sonne, the tenor of which covenant we find laid down by the Prophet, *Eſay* 53. 10, *&c.* and commented upon by the Apoſtle, *Phil.* 2. 6. There we ſee, firſt the work that Chriſt by covenant was to undergo, *To make his ſoul an offering for ſinne*, that is, as elſewhere is expreſt, to give his life a ranſome for many, and as he covenanted, ſo he did, *He became obedient to death, even the death of the croſſe*, Phil. 2. 8. and that, upon account of this covenant entred, Chriſt himſelf ſpeaking to it, and of his work in it, ſaith, *John* 10. 18. *This Commandment have I received of my Father.* Secondly, the reward that he was to receive, which is laid down by the Prophet in many words. 1. *He ſhall ſee his ſeed*, ver. 10. As *Iſaac* being received from the dead in a figure, ſaw a ſeed, had an innumerable poſterity; ſo the Lord Chriſt who was received from the dead in truth; hath his ſeed in like manner, beleevers innumerable, which are called his ſeed in reſemblance to the ſeed of man. 2. *He ſhall prolong his dayes*, not the dayes of his ſeed, as ſome would have it, making this one with the former, and rendring the words *videbit ſemen longævum*, being delivered from death, he ſhall live and reign eternally, *Revel.* 1. 18. 3. *The pleaſure of the Lord ſhall proſper in his hand*; he ſhall irreſiſtibly do whatſoever is the Fathers pleaſure to be done in the work of mans ſalvation. 4. *He ſhall ſee the travel of his ſoul, and ſhall be ſatisfied*; upon this work done, he fully enjoys the whole of all his deſires. 5. *Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he ſhall divide the ſpoile with the ſtrong.* He obtains a perfect victory, hath a plenary and full conqueſt over every adverſary. 2. We yeeld that the whole of theſe covenant-tranſactions, between God and Chriſt, was on our behalf. Making his ſoul an offering for ſinne, he offers it for thoſe that are fallen by iniquity; All is, (as is there ſaid) for the juſtification of many. Whatſoever it is, that upon the work done redounds to himſelf, yet the reaſon of undertaking

was

was for us, *Unto us he was borne, unto us he was given, He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, he was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification;* He endured the mulct, and we reap the benefit. 3. We confesse that it is the work of Christ that we enjoy a being in covenant, as it is his gift that we enjoy the blessing of Ordinances. But when all these are yeelded, the truth must be asserted, that there is a covenant to which Scripture constantly speaks, which is entred of God with man, and not with Christ, which me thinks with much ease might be made to appear.

1. There are frequent testimonies of Gods entry of covenant with his people. 1. With the leading persons in the covenant, which stand as the root of many thousand branches, which are their off-spring in covenant. He entred covenant with *Abraham*, *Gen.*15.18. *Gen.*17.2. The like he enters with *Isaac*, Gen. 26. 3. with *Jacob*, Gen. 35.11. and therefore he is so frequently called the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.* And the covenant of God is alike known by the name of the covenant with *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.* 2 He enters covenant with the whole body of the people of *Israel*, *Deut.*5.1,2. *Hear O Israel, the statutes, and judgements, which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep them, and do them. The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb, the Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us who are all of us alive this day*; And this whole visible body of *Israel* was not Christ.

2. There are testimonies of *Israels* entrance into covenant with God, *Deut.*29.10,11,12. *Ye stand this day, all of you before the Lord your God; your Captaines of your Tribes, your Elders, and your Officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and the stranger that is in thy Camp, from the hewer of thy wood, unto the drawer of thy water, that thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day.* Psalme 50.5. *Gather my Saints together unto me, those that have made a Covenant with me by sacrifice*, Deut. 26.17. *Thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, and to walk in his ways.*

3. The particular time, and place of Gods entrance into covenant with his people, is, in Scripture noted likewise. In *Horeb* as

we

we have heard, which was the first yeare of their coming out of *Egypt*, the third moneth, *Exod* 19. 1. Again, in the fourth year, the eleventh moneth, the first day, *Deut.* 1. 3. *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. compared. *This day* saith the text. Now, there was no day, in which the covenant of God, with Christ, was entred, no day, when it was not entred, but it was from all eternity, as, all the works of the Trinity are, *ad intra*.

4. Covenant duties are imposed, to walk before the Lord, to be *perfect*, to be an *holy*, *peculiar people*, Gen. 17, 1. Exod. 19. 6. These are not imposed upon Christ, but upon Christians.

5. The people of God have the praise of keeping, and are under the blame of covenant-breaking, which praise of faithfulnes, and blame of perfidiousnesse is ascribed to them, and not to Christ Jesus.

6. They that have the seals of the covenant given them, are in covenant; but man receives the Seales, both of Baptisme and the Lords Supper; as, the people of God of old, did Circumcision, and the Passeover, therefore, man is in covenant.

7. If the covenant were made, with Christ, and not with man, then he is a Mediatour between God and himself, and not between God and man. This is plain, in that he is the Mediatour of the covenant, *viz.* between persons in covenant; But he is not a Mediatour between God and himself, which were absurd to imagine, but between God and man, *There is one Mediatour between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5.

There is only I think that one difficult text of the Apostle to be objected against this thing, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to Abraham and his seed, were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ*, from whence some conclude, that the covenant was entred of God, with no other of *Abrahams* seed, but with Christ, consequently not with man, but with Christ only. As this was not in my thoughts in my first Edition, so, I shall not now (as I soon might) weary my self, and reader, in wading into all the difficulties about it, being such as have occasioned, not onely the Jewes to insult, as *Calvin* observes but *Hierom* (the greatest Linguist among the ancients) to speak words unworthy of such an Apostle, which I shall spare

N3 Compl. Roberts on the Covt Pag. 76. & Gale in his Summary of the two Covts Pag. 1 & 8. prefixed to Mr Strongs Discourse on the two Covts

See also Mr. Strongs Treatise Pag. 124, 125, 126. &

& Perkins on 1 Creed, Vol. 1. Pag. 177, 178.

to repeat, and, all, upon the occasion of the Apostles words, *That the promises, were not made to Abraham, and his seeds, as of many, but his seed, as of one*, on which the forenamed father says, *Running over the whole Scripture, both with his eye, and memory; he doth not finde the word seed ever used in the plural number, but alwayes in the singular, whether it be in the better, or worse sense.* But *Gomarus* on the words takes him up as being too short in his memory, and quotes *Samuels* speech, 1 *Sam.* 8. 15. to the contrary, where the word is used plurally, *Rivet* indeed, *Exercit.* 108. *in Genes.* seemes to help him out, though he do not mention him, affirming, that the word [seed] is never used in the plural number, for the posterity of men; but always collectively used in the singular number. The place objected in *Samuel* speaking of the seed of the earth, but *Ravanellus* on the Apostles behalf, pleads, *That it is uncertain, whether the word be only used of the Hebrews in the singular number, for though it be not used plurally, in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, yet it cannot thence be gathered, that the word hath onely the singular number, and wants the plural; when it is without all doubt, that all the words which have been in use with the Hebrews, are not to be found in the Old Testament.* Howsoever, I am not the man, from whom a satisfying Comment on these words may be expected; others more able, that have travelled in it, may be consulted, yet I doubt not, but enough may be easily said, to vindicate it from this glosse that is here put upon it, and to make it appear that this text will not bear this doctrine, that the covenant of grace is not entred with fallen man, but with Christ only, which may appear by these following Reasons. 1. There is no safe opposing any one difficult text (about which Expositors are at so much difference among themselves) against, so many that are full, and clear against it. The texts that are against it are (as I may say) without number, and this, I think, stands alone, with any colour for it. Thus the Papists have adventured to fasten their purgatory on 1 *Cor.* 3. 13, 14. and some few like difficult places. 2. The word covenant is not in the text, neither under the more proper word συνθήκη, nor yet διαθήκη, but αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι; *promises*, in the plural number, repeated again, *verse* 19. in the singular, and a promise, and a covenant (as *Paraus* on the words observes) much differ. 3. If they will needs understand by promises to, a covenant with, as

every covenant is a promiſe, though every promiſe be not a covenant, they differ as the *Genus* and the *Species*, yet there is that in the text, (as Maſter *Bulkley* in his Treatiſe of the covenant obſerves) which makes againſt them, they ſay this covenant is made with Chriſt, and with none but Chriſt; but in the text, it is otherwiſe, *Abraham* is made a party in the covenant, as well as Chriſt, which ſerves to overthrow their excluſive particle. 4. [*Chriſt*] here in this place may be taken collectively, as [*ſeed*] is uſually taken, and ſo the word is taken, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. *As the body is one, and hath many members, & all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; ſo alſo is Chriſt.* And ſo Mr. *Bulkley*, *Diodati*, *Rivet*, *Gomarus*, and our laſt Annotations upon the words expound it. 5. Being underſtood of Chriſt perſonally (which with ſubmiſſion to better judgements, I confeſſe moſt ſatisfies me) it muſt not be underſtood of Chriſt, as a party in Covenant, for bleſſedneſſe; but as a Mediatour making bleſſed. There are many promiſes in Scripture made to *Abraham*, and the ſeed of *Abraham*, and there is much difference among interpreters, to which of theſe promiſes this text refers; The Reader, if he pleaſe, may conſult *Paræus* on the words, and *Junius* in his parallels, but to what text ſoever it is, that theſe words do refer, I am confident that the Apoſtle ſpeaks not, of any bleſſedneſſe received by covenant; but a promiſe of making Nations bleſſed, and this is not indeed to [ſeeds] as of many, but to [ſeed] as of one, which is Chriſt; which I gather by comparing the words in hand with *v.* 8. of the ſame chapter, *and the Scripture foreſeeing that God would juſtifie the Heathen, through faith, preached before the Goſpel to Abraham, ſaying, In thee ſhall all Nations be bleſſed.* This is the promiſe that this Text holds out, which is not a covenant for bleſſedneſſe, but a promiſe to make bleſſed repeated againe, *verſe* 19. *The Law was added, becauſe of tranſgreſſions till the ſeed ſhould come, to whom the promiſe was made*, which is not Chriſt, collectively, or myſtically, but perſonally conſidered, not entring covenant but as Mediatour of the covenant. So that this text ſerves nothing for this purpoſe. A learned Writer indeed ſayes, *It is beyond my brain to conceive that God ſhould immediately make a Covenant with us, who were children of diſobedience, and of wrath, who could not be capable of any ſuch covenant and conditions.* That Chriſt hath a hand to bring us into covenant, before was yeelded, and how far

he

he hath a hand further to carry on, the covenant may be yet further considered, but man is a party in covenant, and as God may make promises, and give good things to fallen man, so he may enter covenant with him likewise.

CHAP. V.

The outward, and not the inward Covenant, is a covenant, properly so called.

WHereas there is an usual distinction (almost in all that write or speak of the covenant) of a double covenant between God and his people, one external, and the other internal; one passing outwardly, and the other inwardly kept and observed. Or (as Dr. *Preston* expresseth it) a single and a double covenant, which I shall forbear to examine, seeing I know there is a right meaning, though I much doubt whether there be in the Reader a right understanding. My second Proposition shall be, that *it is the external Covenant, not the inward, that exactly and properly is called by the name of a Covenant: and to which priviledges of Ordinances and title to Sacraments are annext.* This Proposition, occasioned by this received distinction, is, of three heads, which in case the Reader please, he may subdivide into three distinct Positions.

The outward and not the inward Covenant, is properly a Covenant.

1. *The outward, and not the inward Covenant, is, most exactly and properly called by the name of a Covenant*, which I thus make good: 1. That covenant to which the definition of a covenant doth belong, hath exactly and properly the nature of a covenant, this none can deny: The definition sets out the nature of the thing defined; But the definition most actly belongs, to the outward covenant, not to the inward; This is plain; An agreement of parties, on tearms and Propositions is the definition of a covenant: Now the outward covenant, is an agreement on tearmes and Propositions, as I have abundantly declared, in that covenant God engages himself to man for his happinesse; and man engages to faith and obedience. The inward covenant hath no tearmes or Propositions at all, for man to make good, upon account of his covenanting: seeing the per-

formance of the conditions of the Scripture-covenant, is his very entrance into the inward covenant. He that believes and repents keeps covenant, nothing more is expected of God, or promised by man: But beleeving and repenting, is the first closing with God in covenant, according to them that speak of an inward covenant. 2. A covenant to perform conditions is a covenant properly so called; But the outward covenant, not the inward, is a covenant to perform conditions, This is plain: The conditions in the inward covenant, are the covenant. 3. That which confounds entrance into covenant, and keeping of covenant, is no covenant properly so called; In a covenant properly so called these are distinct: But the inward covenant confounds entrance into covenant and keeping of covenant, and therefore in exact propriety of speech is no covenant.

The outward Covenant is most usually in Scripture called by the name of Covenant.

2. *The outward, and not the inward Covenant, is, most usually in Scripture, called by the name of a Covenant*; which is plaine, in that, they that have no part, or portion, in the inward covenant, are, yet still spoken of, in Scripture, as people in covenant; God calls all *Israel* his people, and that upon covenant termes; *Deut.* 29.10,11,12,13. All of those, that thus covenanted with God, were not in the inward covenant. This people at their worst, and the worst among them, are called the people of God, as by those that were strangers to this covenant: *These are the people of the Lord*, (say the men of *Babylon*) *and are gone forth out of his land*, Ezek. 36.20. so, also by the Lord himself, *Jer.* 2.32. *Can a Bride forget her attire? yet my people have forgotten me dayes without number.* How often doth God own *Israel* as his people, when he yet brands them as *a rebellious, revolting, stiff-necked, treacherous, and adulterous people.* They that forsake the covenant of God, that break covenant, that deale falsely in it, upon whom God brings a sword to avenge the quarrel of his covenant, are in the outward, not in the inward covenant: But such there be among Gods covenant-people, as he frequently complaines, that break covenant, &c. These, are not then, in his inward, but outward covenant.

The great objection is, (and all that carries colour against this) *Jer.* 31.32,33. where the Lord differencing the Old and New covenant, saith, *This is the covenant that I will make with the house of* Israel, *and the house of* Judah: *not according to the*

the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, *which my Covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them, ſaith the Lord: But this ſhall be my Covenant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael, After thoſe dayes, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they ſhall be my people.* That is alone the inward covenant, and the elect regenerate are alone within it. The inward covenant then is called in Scripture a covenant, and is in exact propriety of ſpeech a covenant.

For anſwer, I ſhall have further occaſion to ſpeak to this Text. In this place I ſhall only put ſome Queries.

1. Whether thoſe that carry this Text to an unconditionate covenant, and reſtrain it alone to that which they call the inward covenant, do not make the covenant in the time of the Law, and that in Goſpel-times eſſentially different, and conſequently, either make two covenants of grace, diſtinct, in kind; or thruſt all that were under the Old covenant, out of all hope of ſalvation, contrary to all Interpreters, who make theſe covenants, one in ſubſtance? See the laſt larger Annotations on the words.

2. Whether ſuch an Interpretation, do not utterly contradict New-Teſtament-light, which holds out the New covenant in like latitude with the former, in which many are called, but few are choſen; and where conditions are as explicitely, and fully required, as in Old Teſtament diſpenſations?

3. Whether, when Scripture ſpeaks of things, in oppoſition to mens erroneous conceits, (for a further Explanation of them, and rectifying mens judgements in them) it do uſually lay down a full, compleat, and formal definition, to which nothing is to be added? or whether it doth not, uſually ſupply that, in which men through miſtake were defective and ſhort? And whether thoſe Texts, *Eſay* 58. 6, 7. *Is not this the faſt that I have choſen, to looſe the bands of wickedneſſe, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppreſſed go free, and that ye break every yoak? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are caſt out into thy houſe, when thou ſeeſt the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thy ſelf from thy own fleſh?* Jer. 22. 15; 16. *Did not thy father eat and drink, and do juſtice and judgement,*

and then it was well with him? He judged the cause of the poor and needy, and then it was well with him; was not this to know me, saith the Lord? Jam. 1.27. *Pure Religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherlesse and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world*, are not parallel to this text in their way of delivery. And in case we cannot finde a full definition of a religious Fast in that of *Esay*, nor the whole of it that makes up saving knowledge in that of *Jeremy*, nor the whole that makes Religion compleat in that of *James*; why is it that we should earnestly contend, that the full nature of a covenant is in this text expreſt, being fully parallel in the way of delivery to those other texts.

Men enjoy priviledges of ordinances and intereſt in Sacraments upon account of the outward Covenant.

Thirdly, *It is upon the account of the outward Covenant, and not the inward, that men enjoy priviledges of Ordinances, and intereſt in Sacraments*; Men that are so far honoured as to enjoy an outward covenant, have just title to these priviledges. It is in behalf of the Jew outwardly that the Apostle having so decryed his condition, respective to the approbatiou of God, puts the question, *What advantage hath the Jew? what profit is there of Circumcision? Rom.* 3.1. The Jew and Circumcision are there one; A Jew outwardly, and circumcision in the flesh, go there in equal latitude. He that by nature is a Jew (as *Paul* speaks, *Gal.*2.15.) is of the circumcision; And to these, the Oracles of God are committed; *The instruments, deeds and evidences of the covenants*, say the last Annotations. It was the priviledge of *Israel*, Psal.147. 19. Rom 3. and then, the priviledg of no other Nation; Now it is, the priviledg of all, ingraffed in their stead. This is confeſt, even by a great part of those, that understand the inward covenant, (or covenant keeping to acceptation,) almost whensoever they mention a covenant, in that, they baptize infants, upon covenant grounds, even all their infants that make a covenant profession, and that upon just warranty. It is further plaine in reason, The outward covenant must have priviledges suitable to it self, otherwise there is no manner of benefit, or advantage of it. This priviledge of the Sacrament is suitable, being outward, as the covenant is outward; This is elsewhere spoken to at large, and therefore I shall hear forbear.

I have indeed been challenged for this distinction of an outward and inward covenant, as though I had been the sole Authour of it,

it, when all know that it is a distinction, that of a long time, among Divines hath been in common use; and in case it had not been commonly received, I should have forborne the use of it. As, I heard *Mr. Ball*, once in discourse, say, that he denyed any such distinction, of an outward, and an inward call to the Ministery, all calling being external, unlesse the man called were a Prophet, that which men terme, an inward call, being onely qualifications fitting for the work: So that I deny, in exact propriety of speech, the inward covenant, is any covenant, but the answer of the soul, unto that which the covenant requires. And whereas it is said of me by way of conjecture. *It is probable that he thus distributes them, from the blessings promised, whereof some are inward, and some outward; for though he explain not himself fully, yet I know no other sense that it will bear.* To this I say, that I thus distinguish them, to apply my self to the Readers understanding, that hath been accumstomed, so to call them; and further I say, that men, that barely covenant, and keep not covenant, have onely priviledges that are outward, They are visible Church-members, and they have visible Church-priviledges, and those, who answer to covenant engagements (which usually is called the inward covenant) have priviledges both outward and inward. A Jew outwardly had outward priviledges, A Jew inwardly (that is, he that answered to his outward profession, that worshipped God in spirit) hath both those that were outward and inward. It is further said, *It is evident that his outward Covenant hath no seal; for it is a Covenant* de sigillis conferendis; *If therefore it have a seal, it is either the same which is promised, or some other.* What this Authour means, when he says, it is a covenant *de sigillis conferendis*, I am to learn; If he mean that the seal follows the covenant, and is put to, after the covenant, so it is in all covenants whatsoever. He sayes, *they no where tell us, what is the seal of their outward covenant*; me thinks, we had no need to tell, what the seal of that covenant was, that the Jew entered; was it not circumcision? and did there not another follow, *viz.* the Passeover? Now I tell him that Circumcision and the Passeover, were, and Baptisme and the Lords Supper, are, seales of this covenant. The Nation of the Jewes were in covenant, as our Authour (though he would, yet) must not deny; They were not all in the inward covenant; and yet they had these seales. He says, we are bound to

give

give the ſeals to ſuch, *Vocation which is effectual only to bring men to an outward profeſſion of ſaving faith, is larger then election, and makes men ſuch, whom we are bound to baptize*; And ſuch we ſay have right to them. And to help him a little further. Thoſe men, that he ſayes the Church muſt baptize, though without right, we ſay, are truely in covenant, and have right; when he knows, what a childe he is to baptize, he knows, who we ſay, are in covenant, and have covenant-right to baptiſme; ſo that a ſecond covenant, of which he ſpeaks, to give right to a firſt, is a ſtrange fancy. But ſeeing I am no better underſtood, I ſhall endeavour (if it may be) to clear my meaning in certain poſitions which here follow.

CHAP. VI.

Poſitions tending to clear the thing in queſtion.

Poſitions tending to clear the Authours meaning.

Poſit. 1. 1. *THoſe that take upon themſelves a Chriſtian profeſſion, being ſeparate for God, calling him by the Name of Lord, that have Ordinances of God as their inheritance, that acknowledge a Deity, and no other but the true Deity; a neceſſity of worſhip, and none but the Chriſtian worſhip, theſe with me are in Covenant with God*, as was the whole ſtate of the Church of the *Jews*, and the whole face of the viſible Church of the *Gentiles*, that were ingraffed in their ſtead. This to me is plain, in that they are the *Church* or *Churches* of God, *Act.* 7. 38. *Gal.* 1. 2. *The called of God*, Matth. 22. 14. *The people of God*, Iſa. 1. 2. Pſal. 90. 7. *They ſacrific'd to the true God*, Pſal. 50. 7. Are the *ſons of God*, Gen. 6. 1. Deut. 14. 1. Rom. 9. 4. Are a people *nigh unto the Lord*, Deut. 4. 7. Pſal. 148. *ult.* God profeſſing himſelf to be their God, *Pſal.* 90. 7. Are *children of the Covenant*, Acts 3. 35. *Saints*, Pſalme 90. 5. Acts 26. 10. 1 Cor. 14. 33. *Believers*, Act. 8. 12, 13. Acts 21. 20. Luke 8. 13. *Diſciples*, Matth. 10. 1, 4. Acts 9. 1. & 15. 10. *Chriſtians*, Acts 11. 26. That all of theſe imply a covenant-ſtate; and that unregenerate men, have in Scripture, all this honour, is clear; Theſe therefore with me are in covenant. I know, that as

as to all of these elogies, it is answered in a word, that they are *equivocal.* An answer that I can scarce take into my thoughts without horrour; as though Gods Oracles were all over, from one end of the Bible to the other, like those of *Apollo*, and there were no reality, either in their separation for God, or gifts that they receive from God, (as illumination, conviction, faith) or priviledges that they enjoy; When there can be no plain denial, that all of this here mentioned, argues a covenant-state, yet exceptions are taken. *It seemes* (saith one) *he takes all to be in Covenant that bear the name*, [*Christian.*] And then questions; *What? Though they know not what Christ or Christianity is? Is taking a name, entring into Covenant? The poore* Indians *that by thousands are forced by the* Spaniard *to be baptized, are said to know so little what they do, that some of them forget the name of* [*a Christian*] *which they assumed.* And does not our Authour think that a man may take as plausible exceptions against his words, (where he saith, *The rule is, That a serious professour of the faith is to be taken for a true beleever*, if he would travel as far as *India* for it,) as he doth here against Gods Word? Do not we know, that force may make, these poor *Indians*, to appear serious in their profession? And it is wonder, that it should be so strange with him, that taking a name, should be entring covenant, or at least that it should imply a covenant-state: Let him consult *Isa.* 4. 1. *In that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, we will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; onely let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach*; and those manifold Scripture-Texts, which expresse the relation of Gods covenant-people to him, in these words, *A people called by his Name*; or *on whom the Name of God is called.* Distinction should be put, between children of the covenant, by descent from parents in covenant, whether Jews or Christians, (who continue their covenant-relation, till they professedly cast it off, notwithstanding their ignorance) and such that of meer aliens are to be received, having no other title then their own present qualification. This ought to be voluntary, as well, in renouncing their old false way, as embracing the present, as we see it was, in those converts through the *Acts* of the Apostles, and, is not to be, without some competency of knowledge, discerning the evil of their former course, and the happinesse attainable in the present. And, I am easily induced to believe,

that more knowledge by the industry of teachers, is now required, then was in the primitive times, seeing there is not so much of God, by miracle to perswade, and as it were to over-rule: So that it is not a naked taking of a name that is intended, but that which together with it still attends upon it: As a wife is called by her husbands name, and withall, makes her abode in his house; so it is with a Covenant people, and was with *Israel*; They bore the name of God, and they made abode in the Church of God, enjoying his Ordinances as their inheritance. It is objected, *God oft bestowes his Word on Infidels, and in England there are men that deride the truth of Scripture, and esteem it a fiction, and yet for credit of men come ordinarily to the Congregation. These have the Word given, and so have other unregenerate men, but not by Covenant that I know of.* That God doth bestow his Word on Infidels, to me is strange: It is true that he often tenders it to them, but in case they remain Infidels, they put it away from them, and bestowing implies not only a tender, but an acceptance. It was the great advantage of *Israel*, above other Nations, that to them was committed the Oracles of God, when others had not that honour. And to speak, of Gods giving his Word by Covenant, is a most improper speech, seeing the Word is the very Covenant draughts; as though we should say, he gives his Word, by his Word. And these sure are no open deriders that for the credit of men, make such a publique profession: this would work restraint on the one hand, as it puts upon profession on the other. And in case any such thing be, though the Covenant is perfidiously broke, yet (as I conceive) it is not totally cast off, as long as an open profession is continued. What shall we say of those, that take their sons, and daughters, to give them to *Moloch*? this can be no low crime, and is an high departure from the true God, yet these bring forth children unto God; and they are Gods children, that they thus sacrifice, *Ezek.* 16. 20, 21. So also, *Psal.* 106. 35, &c. *Israel was mingled among the Heathen, and learned their works, and they served their Idols, which were a snare to them; yea, they sacrificed their sons and daughters unto Devils, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and daughters;* Yet this, as appears, cast them not out of Covenant; God notwithstanding *remembred for them his Covenant*, ver. 45. This was therefore doubtlesse but a partial apostasie, Taking in the worship of Idols, they did not totally

tally cast off the worship of God: God was not totally cast off in *Judah*, neither did God cast off *Judah*: *Ahaz* was of the worst of Kings, and yet his posterity was reckoned among the people of the Lord. Had the *Jews* at that time been, as severe disputants against a covenant-state, as are risen up now, the Church of God had wanted an *Hezekiah*, He had never lived, (much lesse wrought so happy a Reformation) in the Church of God.

Posit. 2.

2. *Those that are lookt upon by men, as in Covenant with God, and so ordinarily judged (as the people of Israel were) by the Name that they bear, their abode in the Church, the profession that they make, and so accordingly stiled, are truely, and really in Covenant.* A man may know a man, to appertain to such, or such a person, because he sees him in his family, hears him call him *Master*, sees him, sometimes at least, in his work, and knows, him to have the repute of his servant; Though to know him to be a faithful servant, requires more diligence of enquiry, and a stricter scrutiny: So, a man may be as easily known, to appertaine to Jesus Christ; The same Characters make him known, all that is required, to being in covenant, is, visible, open, evident: but sincerity of heart in covenanting is invisible, and secret. And therefore the Jew outwardly, *Rom.* 2. 28. is called by the *Vulgar*, *Vatablus*, *Tremelius*, *Arias Montanus*, and *Castalio*, *Judæus in manifesto*; by *Calvin*, *Judæus in aperto*; by *Beza*, *Judæus in propatulo*: The Jew inwardly, is called *Judæus in abscondito*, or *occulto*: Their Church, or covenant-station, giving them those great advantages after mentioned, was open and manifest. Those that say, *Lord, Lord*, as, *Mat.* 7. 21. are of those that avouch God to be their God, and God avoucheth them to be his people. And therefore when they come with their sacrifices, though in their sinnes, and God upon that account testifies against them; yet he sayes, *I am God, even thy God.* It is confess'd by an eminent adversary, that *we must judge those that make profession, to be in Covenant with God: we must give them the name of Christians, and men in covenant with God, and we must use them as Christians in works of Charity and Ordinances, and Church-communion, and so must use their children as Christians children.* And seeing reason to judge so, according to Scripture-character of men in covenant, they are so. Either in this we judge right, or else we pro-

ceed upon miſtake, If we judge aright, then all is well: If we miſtake, then, all in theſe proceedings is null. Water hath been applyed to the child of ſuch an one, but no Sacrament diſpens'd, and according to a mans hopes, thoughts or feares of his fathers regeneration, are his hopes, thoughts and feares of his own baptiſme, and conſequently of his intereſt in Church-communion; for this, ſtands, or falls according to his fathers intereſt, or non-intereſt in the covenant. A grand Rule is laid down by the ſaid Authour, *That a ſerious Profeſſour of the faith is to be taken for a true Beleever*: and this being laid down, more are added. If this Propoſition were a Scripture-Maxime, then it would have borne a farther ſuperſtruction, but, being neither found there, nor any proof made, that it is any way deduced thence, mother and daughters, may all juſtly be called into queſtion, and ſeeing he cannot but know, that very many (as to the thing for which it is produc'd (which in order to admiſſion to Ordinances) will utterly deny it, he might have dome well to have made ſome eſſay to have proved it. I do yeeld that charity is to hope the beſt, but but that we ſhould put our charity to it, or our reaſon either, for probability or certainty, when we are no where ſo taught, and have a more ſure rule for our proceeding, I ſee no reaſon. I can ſcarce meet with a Miniſter that ſayes, (and I have put the queſtion to many of the moſt eminent that I know) that he baptizeth any infant upon this ground of hope that the parent is regenerate, but ſtill with earneſt vehemence profeſſes the contrary. I deſire the Reader to conſider Maſter *Cobbets* third and fourth Concluſions in his juſt Vindication, *page* 46. 52. *There is a bare external being in the Covenant of Grace*, ſaith he, *of perſons who poſſibly never ſhall be ſaved.* Concl. 3d. *The Church in diſpenſing an enjoyned initiatory ſeal of the Covenant of Grace looketh unto viſibility of intereſt in the Covenant, to guide her in the application thereof. Nor is it the ſaving intereſt, of the perſons in view, which is her rule, by which ſhe is therein to proceed.* Concl. 4th. Viſibility of intereſt, and ſaving intereſt are there oppos'd. See alſo Maſter *Hudſon*, pag. 249. *John Baptiſt did not in his conſcience think they had all actually, really and compleatly repented and reformed themſelves, whom he baptized, but he baptized them unto repentance*, Matth. 3. 11. *and they by receiving the ſame bound themſelves to endeavour*

the

the practise thereof. It were a sad case for Ministers, if they were bound to admit none, or administer the Lords Supper to none, but such as were truly godly; or that they judged in their conscience to be so, or were bound to eject all that they judged were not so.

3. *Mans obligation of himself in covenant unto God, upon the termes by him proposed, necessarily implies Gods obligation to man.* Posit. 3.
Where God makes tender of the Gospel, by his Ministers to any one out of covenant, there he makes tender of the Covenant; and where a person, or people, professedly accept, that is, engage themselves, (as myriads of thousands did through the *Acts of the Apostles*) this person, this people, each man of them is in covenant. As Scripture calls them by the name of *Saints, Disciples, Beleevers, Christians*, so we may call them *Covenanters*. They have all a sanctity of separation, which *Camero* sayes, is real, and arguments are drawn from thence to a right in Baptisme, There is in most of them, if not in all, some graces that are real; either common or saving, and a covenant doth not wait, till the termes be kept, and the conditions made good, before it hath the being of a covenant. And whether these be every way sincere, or any way dissembling, yet it is acknowledged, that they really oblige themselves: And God howsoever dissembles not, but is bound by himself, upon his own terms, which they profedly accept, to confer all that the covenant holds forth, so that, wheresoever man is obliged, there a compleat covenant is made up, for Gods tender goes before, and man is the last party, and compleats the Covenant.

4. *Sincerity, and integrity of heart; or fully reality, in a mans intentions, to stand to the whole of a Covenant, is not of the essence, and being of it.* Posit. 4.
Both parties stand engaged, upon their respective termes, though one part should have unsincere intentions. A wife is a wife, and the marriage is compleat, when both parties have publickly expres'd consent, though she hold a resolution to be stubborn, refractory, profuse, &c. A man consenting to serve, whether in bare words, or taking earnest, as is most usual, or by hand and seal; as in the case of apprentices, is a servant although he intend with *Onesimus* to purloyn, or take his opportunity to be gone. Some thinks it makes for their advantage, to say, that unregenerate men are unsincere in covenant; but that

conceſſion, utterly deſtroys them. If they be unſincere, or as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks, not ſtedfaſt in covenant, then they are in covenant, *A propoſitione ſecundi adjacentis, ad propoſitionem primi adjacentis, valet argumentum.* If it be true that *Catiline* is a ſeditious man, then it is true, that he is a man: that *Peribomius* is a vicious man, then he is a man; that *Judas* is treacherous and perfidious in covenant, then he is in covenant: A mans conviction, that he is an unjuſt ſteward, or an unfaithful ſervant, doth not conclude him to be no ſervant, or no ſteward, but the contrary. And whereas it is ſaid, *The differences muſt be taken notice of, between humane Covenants, and ours with God; or elſe all will be marred. Men know not one anothers hearts, and therefore make not laws for hearts, nor impoſe conditions on hearts: and therefore if both parties do confeſſe conſent, though diſſembledly, they are both obliged, & the Covenant is mutual. But God offers to conſent only on condition that our hearts conſent to his terms, and therfore if we profeſs conſent, & do not conſent, God conſenteth not, nor is, as it were, obliged.* This were ſomewhat to purpoſe, in caſe it could be made to appear that Scripture denies all being of a covenant between God and man, where the all-ſeeing eye of God ſees not all integrity and ſincerity. But Scripture-language which is the ſafeſt for us to follow, being (as we have heard) far otherwiſe, there is nothing marr'd in non-obſervance of any ſuch ſuppoſed difference; See *Pſal.* 78. 34, 35, 36. *When he ſlew them, then they ſought him; and they returned, and enquired early after God. And they remembred that God was their Rock, and the High God their Redeemer. Neverthleſſe they did flatter him with their mouth: and they lied unto him with their tongues.*

Paſit. 5. 5. *There is a real and ſerious purpoſe in many unregenerate perſons to ſerve the Lord, and to come up to as much as they think he in covenant requires*, though with *Auſtin* they have a great mind to delay, and often to put off, the thought of, their more exact, and ſerious ſervice; and too ordinarily think that they keep covenant, when they break it, having not as yet any right knowledge, either of their own hearts, or Gods commands, and in this poſture, in which they thus ſtand, before they come up any higher, yea, though they never come higher, they reach unto graces in themſelves real, true, and good, and all do, the works which God commands; *There is a common grace which is not ſa-*

ving,

ving, yet real, and ſo true, and good, and ſo true grace, as well as ſpecial grace which is ſaving, ſaith Maſter *Baxter Saints everlaſting Reſt*, Part. 3. Sect. 6. Which may be a faire anſwer to that which is objected againſt me, that in my *explication of Dogmatical faith, I adde by way of excluſion* [*though not affecting the heart to a full choice of Chriſt*] *where he ſeems* (ſaith my adverſary) *to imply, though he expreſſe it not, that the faith that he meaneth doth affect the heart to a choice of Chriſt which is not full. But if ſo, then, 1. It is much more then aſſent, or a meer Hiſtorical, Dogmatical Faith. 2. But is the choice, which he intimateth real as to the act, and ſuited to the object? That is, the real choice of ſuch a Chriſt as is offered, and on ſuch termes? If ſo, it is juſtifying faith: If not, either it is counterfeit, as to the act, or but nominal, as to the object, and is indeed no chooſing of Chriſt.* That which is real and true, is neither counterfeit nor meerly nominal, ſo far as they know, either Chriſt or their own hearts, they undiſſembledly chooſe, and take to him, as expecting to be happy in him, and not in any other object; though too often it is upon miſ-information, and when they come to a right underſtanding of the termes, they are in danger to quit the way in which they might enjoy him. It is further ſaid *That, I think that there may be an undiſſembled profeſſion, which yet may not be of a ſaving faith; But then I conceive*, ſaith one, *it is not an entire profeſſion of the whole eſſential object of Chriſtian faith*, viz. *of aſſent and conſent.* In which he doth but caſt duſt in his Readers eyes, in confounding the intireneſſe of the object, and the integrity of the ſubject. There may be an entire profeſſion of the whole eſſential object of faith, where the will is brought in to make no more full choice, or conſent then hath been ſaid, and the deſired integrity of the ſubject wanting; I am told, *It will be an hard ſaying to many honeſt Chriſtians, to ſay that a man not juſtified may believe every fundamental article, and withal truly profeſſe repentance of all his ſinnes, and to take God for his Sovereign to rule him, and his chief good to be enjoyed to his happineſſe, and to take Chriſt for his Lord, and only Saviour, and his Word for his Law and Rule, and the Holy Ghoſt for his guide and Sanctifer, and the reſt which is eſſential to Chriſtianity.* I think it will be nothing hard for any honeſt Chriſtian to ſay, that a man not juſtified, may believe every fundamental article, as to aſſent, and that he may be convinc'd

of

of the neceſſity of ſuch repentance, and accordingly to make profeſſion of it, as *Johns* converts (who were not all juſtifi'd) did, and were baptiz'd into it, or that ſuch an one may freely yeeld, that God hath right of Sovereignty and rule, and that he is the chief good to be enjoyed for happineſſe, and that he ought to take Chriſt for his Lord, and Saviour, &c. and that this may be done truly, not only as to reality of aſſent, but as to reality of purpoſe to make this choice, ſo farre as the man knows his own heart, or the minde of God in this work, though there be not that integrity, to yeeld up himſelf wholly, which yet by the power of Ordinances through the Spirit, in Gods time may be done, and through grace perfected.

Poſit. 6. Laſtly, *God ſetting up a viſible Church upon earth, in order to that which is inviſible, will have thoſe admitted, that give aſſent to Scripture-doctrine, and accordingly make profeſſion*: And this, of it ſelf *in foro Dei*, brings them into covenant-right, and viſible Church-membership. And therefore according to the minde of God (and, as *Apollonius* ſpeaks, *jure Dei* in this eſtate) are to be received, Though they ſhall hit, or miſſe of the mercy of the covenant, accordingly, as by grace they come up to, or by ſin fall ſhort of the Propoſitions contained in it. *A Scholar* (ſaith Mr. *Hudſon*) *that is admitted into a School, is not admitted becauſe he is* doctus, *but*, ut ſit doctus; *and if he will ſubmit to the rules of the Schoole, and apply himſelf to learne, it is enough for his admiſſion. The like may be ſaid of the Church-viſible which is Chriſts School*; *Vindicat.* pag. 248. *The door of the viſible Church*, (ſaith Maſter *Baxter*, *Saints Reſt.* Part. 4. Sect. 3.) *is incomparably wider then the door of heaven; and Chriſt is ſo tender, ſo bountiful, and forward to convey his grace, and the Goſpel ſo free an offer, and invitation to all, that ſurely Chriſt will keep no man off: if they will come quite over in ſpirit to Chriſt, they ſhall be welcome: if they will come but onely to a viſible profeſſion, he will not deny them admittance.* This ſeems to me to ſpeak the mind of Jeſus Chriſt for their admittance, and that *in foro Dei*, as well as *in foro Eccleſiæ*, they ſtand in covenant-relation, and have title to Church-membership. Thus the Reader may ſee my thoughts in this thing; and though I doubt not, but that ſome will queſtion much that I have ſaid; yet now at laſt, I hope, my meaning may be underſtood.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Covenant of Grace calls for Conditions from Man.

A Third Propoſition which I ſhall here lay down, is, *that Gods covenant with man hath its reſtipulation from man, when God engages to man, to conferre happineſſe upon him, he requires conditions from him.* This I know hath ſtrong oppoſition by men of two ſorts, and they of different ſtamps, and for different ends. The firſt deny all Goſpel-conditions, all covenant-termes on mans part, to the end they may aſſert juſtification before, and without Faith, Salvation without Repentance, and Obedience, which though it be contradicted by abundant teſtimonies of Scripture (placing unbeleeving, impenitent and diſobedient ones in hell: under the wrath of God, yea ſuch unbeleeving, impenitent ones that have laid higheſt claime to Chriſt, *Matth.* 7. 23.) yet it ſeems wholly to follow, and neceſſarily to be evinced from this abſolute unconditionate covenant. If Chriſt have wholly finiſhed, not only the work of mans redemption, but alſo of his ſalvation upon the croſſe, without farther work of application (as one in a diſtinct Treatiſe hath made it his endeavour to prove) then we may, as he there doth, decry, both our faith in Chriſt, and Chriſts interceſſion for us. Herein one of late (according to his wonted weakneſſe) is very induſtrious, and whereas the Scripture tells us, *Chriſt dwells in our hearts by Faith*, Epheſ. 3.17. he would prove, that Chriſt enters into us, without us, dwells in the unbeleeving, and in reference to this opinion of his, he makes it his buſineſſe, as, to deny Faith, in reference to Juſtification, ſo, all Goſpel-covenant-conditions. *All other covenants beſides this were* (ſaith he) *upon a ſtipulation, and the promiſe was altogether upon conditions on both ſides. But in this covenant of Grace*, viz. *the new covenant, it is far otherwiſe, there is not any condition in this covenant, I ſay the new covenant is without any condition whatſoever.* And he further tells his hearers, that *he is on a nice point, Faith is not the condition of the covenant.* Others,

The Covenant of Grace calls for conditions from man.

thers, utterly distasting the aforenamed opinions, of Justification without faith, or salvation without obedience, or repentance (which seeme to be the natural issue and necessary consequents of an unconditional covenant,) yet, with great resolution do affirme; the covenant to be without conditions, joyning in the premisses with these heterodox teachers, but peremptorily denying the conclusion. Against both of these that oppose it, either more desperately, or more innocently, I affirm (and might quote a cloud of witnesses) that the covenant of grace hath its conditions; which to me is clear.

Arguments for a conditional Covenant.

First, by the definition of a covenant, given in, by the Authour before named, a few pages before his assertion before mentioned. *It is a mutual agreement, between parties, upon certaine Articles or Propositions, on both sides, so that each party is bound and tyed to perform his own conditions.* It is in the definition and of the essence of a covenant in general (according to him) to have conditions, yet this covenant in particular, with him, is without condition; Here is a *species*, that partakes not of the nature of the *genus*, a particular covenant that wants the essence of a covenant, which is the same as though he should finde us a man that is no living creature, a Vine or Fig-tree that is no plant, a piece of scarlet of no colour; such a thing is this unconditional covenant. If the essence of a covenant require it, then this covenant is not without it.

Secondly by the expresse Texts of Scripture, which lay down conditions of the covenant, either in expresse words, or those that of necessity imply a condition. See *John* 8.51. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.* Who sees not there, First, a Priviledge granted by way of covenant. Secondly, the condition on which it is to be obtained. *John* 8.24. *If ye beleeve not that I am he, ye shall die in your sinnes.* Heb. 3.6. *Whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence, and the rejoycing of the hope firme unto the end.* Who knows not, *If*, to be a conditional particle? All pardon and justification (if Scripture may be heard) is suspended on mens not beleeving, *John* 3.16. *For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever beleeveth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.* Mar. 16.16. *He that beleeveth, and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that beleeveth not, shall be damned.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, by Analogy with the covenant of Works, entred of God with *Adam* in innocency, *Gen.* 2. 17. This, on all hands that (I know) is granted to have been conditional, and who sees not in the Texts mentioned, conditions as expresse in the Gospel, as *not eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil*, to man in Paradise? either, both, or neither, must be conditional.

Fourthly, from the nature of conditions in covenants. A condition in a covenant, is somewhat agreed upon by the Parties in covenant, upon performance of which the benefit of the covenant is obtained, and upon the failing of it, the whole benefit is lost, and the penalty, whatsoever it is, incurred. In covenants between equals, either indent, and article what those conditions shall be, upon defaylance of which the benefit is lost, and the penalty incurred. In covenants between superiour and inferiour, the superiour doth prescribe, and the inferiour doth yeeld. In all covenants there are such conditions, that upon performance or failing of them, the covenant doth stand or fall: such there are in the Gospel-covenant. There we are enjoyned to believe and repent, upon obedience to, and performance of these, we reap the benefit of the covenant, Upon failing in them the benefit is lost, and the penalty incurred *He that beleeveth not, shall be damned. Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.* There are then conditions in this covenant.

Fifthly, from the absurdities that will follow upon the denial of conditions on mans part in the covenant. First, then man is out of danger of being faulty in the covenant, he can be no covenant-breaker, He cannot be charged that his heart is unsteady in it. This of it self is plaine, He that is tyed to nothing, fails in nothing, he that is engaged to no service, neglects no service; As God hath that glory that he keeps covenant, so man hath that Priviledge, that he is not in a capacity of breaking of it. The Church might have spared that Apology for themselves, *that they had not dealt falsely in the covenant*, Psal. 44. 17. seeing they were under no such engagement, that they could falsifie, or in any such capacity of being false; but we finde God complaining against his People for breach of covenant, *Jerem.* 11. 10. *Isa.* 24. 5. *Psal.* 78. 10, 37. we finde him giving out his threats to avenge the quarrel of his covenant, *Levit.* 26. 25. Master *Baxters*

Queſtioniſt (who ſeems contrarily minded) thought it an exception of validity, *That it follows from his doctrine, that the New covenant is never violated by any.* I am ſure it follows from this doctrine, that it is not in any capacity of violation. Secondly, then we may ſay (as the Apoſtle in another caſe) *Our preaching is in vain*, at leaſt to ſalvation vaine, the Goſpel in mans mouth is no power of God to ſalvation. In faith or unbelief, in a penitent or unrepentant condition, in holineſſe or diſobedience, God will ſave; he looks neither at faith, uprightneſſe, or any qualification, when in a covenant-way he engages himſelfe to conferre ſalvation. In caſe God doth not regard it, to what end is there any paines to work a people to it? This I know ſome Aſſertours of this doctrine will diſclaime, but let them ſhew how they will avoid it.

CHAP. VIII.

A grand Objection againſt this doctrine anſwered.

A grand objection againſt the conditionality of the Covenant of Grace anſwered.

HEre an objection of weight; by reaſon of the difficulty of ſome Scripture-Texts, on which it is grounded, is to be taken into conſideration, *It is true* (ſaith one) *that in covenants uſually there is a mutual contract, and there are mutual performances, to which perſons are engaged thereby. But for the thing it is certaine, that however the words of* fœdus pactum, *in Latine,* συνθήκη *in Greek, covenant in Engliſh be uſed, the Hebrew* Berith, *and the Greek* διαθήκη, *uſed in the Old and New Teſtament, do not alwayes import a mutual contract and mutual performances. God is ſaid to eſtabliſh a Covenant with all living*, Gen. 9. 9, 10. *between whom and God, there neither is, nor can be a mutual contract and performance. And the term rendred covenant, is not only rendred Teſtament; but alſo the holy Writers do illuſtrate the New covenant, rather by the metaphor of a Teſtament, then of a covenant*, 1 Corinth. 11. 25. Gal. 3. 15. Heb. 9 16, 17. *and where the Promiſes are ſet down without any reciprocal contract or duty expreſt*, Heb. 8. 10, 11, 12. *and* 10. 16, 17. Rom. 11. 26, 27.

This

This argument, is against all being of covenants, as well as the conditionality of them, as indeed, if conditions be denied, all being of a covenant is destroyed, and therefore it might have been well brought in; where the covenant it self was asserted, as militating against the very being of it. But it cannot conveniently be held out in both places, and therefore it must be considered here, and for answer, let us first take what is granted, that usually in covenants there is a mutual contract, and that these words, Latine, and Greek, be used to imply such covenants, in which there are mutual contracts, and mutual performances, and to which persons are engaged on both sides; and then let us examine what is affirmed concerning those two words, *Berith* and διαθήκη, for the contrary.

And for the first, who does not know, that the word is sometimes used for a covenant improperly so called? A bare command, *Jer.* 34.13. A bare Seal, *Gen.* 17.10. is (as we have heard) called a covenant. And, so a bare promise here in the place quoted is called a covenant likewise; Not that beasts and birds can covenant, but they shall be as secure from the judgement there mentioned, as though there had past a mutual contract in the strongest engagements, *Eliphaz* shewing the priviledges of the godly, saith; Job 5.23. *They shall be in league with the stones of the field*, the same word is in both places; shall we now say, that a league or covenant is no act of reason, because man is in league and covenant with stones, which are unreasonable creatures? or rather shall we say with Master *Caryl* in his *Exposition*, *To be in League with stones is an improper and allusive speech, stones are not capable of the formalities of a League?* So we say, for God to make a covenant with unreasonable creatures, with beasts, birds, and creeping things, is an improper and allusive speech likewise. Birds, Beasts, and creeping things are in an incapacity of covenant. *Gomarus* handling that question of Universal Redemption in his *Comment* on *Gal.* 1. (a Patron of the *Lutherans*, as he calls him, disputing for it from the form of the covenant of Grace as that Disputant stiles it, *Gen.* 3.17. where the seed of the woman is promised to break the Serpents head,*) denies that those words containe the forme of a covenant; because *it is certain* (as he sayes)

* *Antecedens falsâ nititur hypothesi, quasi verbis illis formula fœderis gratiæ contineretur.—— Contrà verò fœdus propriè obligationem duarum partium certis utrinque conditionibus complecti certum est, qualem hoc loco extare probare non potest: ideoque nec fœdus propriè est.*

that

that a Covenant properly so called, containes an obligation of two parties, with conditions on both sides; which cannot be proved (saith he) *in those words, and therefore it is not a covenant properly so called.* From which learned hand we see, 1. That a covenant properly so called is of two parties. 2. That both parts have their conditions. 3. That there is a covenant between God and man properly so called, in which God and man are both obliged. 4. That no Scripture-expression holds out this covenant, that holds not out these conditions.

This is the proper acception for which we contend, and improper acceptions as they do not hold forth the nature of a covenant, so we confesse they do not imply mutual contracts, or mutual performances. So that the Argument is brought to this, A covenant sometimes in an improper sense is said to be made with those that cannot make mutual contracts; therefore a covenant is no mutal contract, nor hath any mutual engagements. We might as well argue, that because a stone is called a witnesse, *Josh.* 24.27. a heap of stones is so called, *Gen.* 31.48. (which have neither eyes, nor ears, to see or hear, what is done or said, nor yet a tongue to utter it) therefore there is no use of eyes, or ears, or of a tongue, in any one that is brought for a witnesse. As the Hebrew word *Berith* is improperly used, or at least used in a sense, more large then to denote a covenant, whereſoever it doth not hold out an agreement of two parties with engagements on both hands: So the word διαθήκη, whensoever it is used in that sense, seemes to be taken improperly, Seeing in its received signification (according to good Interpreters) it doth denote not a covenant, but a mans last Will and Testament, which never is of force, but by the death of the Testator, *Heb* 9.16,17. which is not true of a Covenanter, his death is not required to make the covenant valid.[a] So Ravanellus, *Testament* (saith he) *in Greek* διαθήκη *is taken*, 1 *Properly, for the declaration of a mans Will concerning that which he would have done after his death, and is ratified by the death of the Testator; for it is not of force while the Testator liveth*, Heb. 9. 16,17. 2. *Improperly for a covenant, which living men enter among themselves.* Rivet, *also* Exercit. 103. *in* Gen. speaking of those words of

[a] *Testamentum Græcè* διαθήκη *sumitur*,

1. *Propriè pro suprema animi seu voluntatis nostræ sententia de eo, quod post mortem nostram fieri cupimus, sic Testamentum morte testatoris ratum est, nondum enim valet cùm vivit testator.*

2. *Impropriè, pro pactione vel fœdere, quod viventes inter se inire solent.*

of the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 4. 24. *Theſe are two Teſtaments.* [b] *Teſtament there* (he ſaith) *is not to be taken, in a proper ſignification for that which is done by a dying man, and ratified by his death, but, for a covenant-agreement, or order as* Pererius *hath well obſerved.* *Alſted* in his *Lexicon Theologicum* having ſpoken to the ſenſe in which tranſlatours of the Bible ſometimes uſe it, as the ſame with συνθήκη, reſolves, [c] *We muſt yeeld ſomewhat to cuſtome.* After ſaith. *Teſtament properly ſignifies a juſt declaration of a mans Will, concerning that which he would have done with his goods after his death. The Greeks properly call it* διαθήκη. *Eſtius* is very [d] full, ſetting out the Original denotation of the word, together with the received ſignification of it. *For though* διαθήκη (ſaith he) *if you look to the Etymologie of the word, holds out no more then a diſpoſing, and with Greek Authours* (*as* Budæus *witneſſeth in his Comment on the Greek tongue*) *ſignifies in general a covenant-agreement or promiſe; yet the common and moſt received ſignification is the ſame, as* Teſtamentum *in the Latine, which is the declaration of a mans Will concerning that whith he would have done after his death.* The Apoſtles Application of a Teſtament properly ſo called to the covenant of God, *Heb.* 9. 16, 17. hath troubled many Interpreters. *Eraſmus* on this acount queſtions the Authors skill in the Hebrew tongue, and *Cajetan* calls into queſtion the authority of the Epiſtle. Moſt conclude from hence, that the Original of the Epiſtle was Greek, in that there is not Hebrew words to hold out ſuch expreſſions, and the Syriack tranſlator was put to it, to keep the Greek word, and put it into a Syriack Character. For the clearing of this doubt, it is not enough to ſay, that theſe words are ſometimes promiſcuouſly uſed. *Berith* for a Teſtament, διαθήκη for a Covenant, as *Camerarius* notes out of *Ariſtophanes*, a Greek Poet, as *Rivet* obſerves, Seeing the Apoſtle applies a [Teſtament] in the proper received ſenſe to that which ſignifies a mutual agreement. For the ſalving of which *Eſtius* reckons up ſeveral

[b] *Nomen Teſtamenti, ſumi non debet in propria ſignificatione, pro eo quod fit ab homine jam morituro, ſed pro fœdere, pacto, & diſpoſitione, ut bene animadvertit* Pererius.

[c] *Aliquid dandum eſt conſuetudini.*

[d] *Quamvis enim* διαθήκη, *ſi vocis etymon attendas, non plus ſonet quàm diſpoſitionem, & apud authores Græcos, Budæo teſte in commentariis Græcæ linguæ, ſignificet in genere pactum, conventum, pollicitationem: conſtat tamen vulgarem & receptiſſimam ejus ſignificationem eſſe, quâ denotet idem quòd apud Latinos Teſtamentum, id eſt, voluntatis decretum, de eo quod quis poſt mortem ſuam fieri velit.*

several opinions which he rejects, some of which, others of good note follow, and afterwards acquaints the Reader with his own thoughts, in words drawn out to such a length, that I shall refer the Reader (if he please) to the Authour himself. *Dixon* on the words, saith, *The Articles of the covenant also evince it to be a Testament, and the promiser bound to make his word good, and so to die. For* Jer. 31. *The Lord Christ promiseth to reconcile his people to God, to take away their sinnes, and to be their God. Justice required satisfaction of them before they could be reconciled, satisfaction they could not make themselves, therefore he who promised to make the reconciliation with God, was found to make the satisfaction for them to God: and if satisfaction for them, then to under-lie the curse of the Law for them, and so to die.* [e] Gomarus *says, The covenant of the New Testament, is both a covenant and a Testament. It is a covenant because it is an agreement between God and man concerning salvation promised, and faith owing by man: And a Testament, because it is established upon the promised death of the Son of God, and an heavenly inheritance by it, so that it may not unworthily be called a Testamentary covenant, or a Testament-covenant, by reason of the concurrence of both in one. And after concludes, Simply it is a covenant by reason of the mutual agreement between God and beleevers; Respectively a Testament, by reason of the way, and manner of the chief and most eminent part in the covenant, that is the promise of grace, whereby God promiseth to be our God propitious to us, and to give us everlasting life, as an inheritance by the death of his Son.*

[e] Fœdus N. T. & fœdus est, (quia est mutuum inter Deum, & homines salutis promissæ, & obedientiæ fidei ab hominibus debitæ pactum) & simul Testamentum est; quia hoc fœdus promissa filii Dei morte, & per eam hæreditate cælesti à Deo sancitum est: adeo ut non immeritò fœdus Testamentarium, & Testamentum fœderis ob concursum utriusque queat appellari. Indè constat simpliciter quidem esse fœdus, ratione pacti mutui Dei & fidelium, sed secundùm quid esse Testamentum, ratione modi, partis ac potioris in fœdere nempe promissionis gratiæ, quâ Deus nobis promittit se fore Deum nostrum propitium & vitam æternam daturum tanquam hæreditatem, merito obedientiæ mortis Filii sui.

[f] *Junius* in his parallels undertaking to give satisfaction, hath a remedy (with me) worse then the disease, though learned Mr. *Grayle* endeavours his Vindication. After a large discourse in what latitude the word *Berith* is taken: *The Apostle* (he saith) *shewes*

[f] *Circumscriptionem hujus nominis ex typis atq; umbraculis legis demonstrat paulò pòst*, ver. 15. & sequentibus *Apostolus. Cùm omnino statuit, Dei gratiam eo luculentiorem hominibus explicatam esse: quòd suis non fœdus, sed Testamentum dederit: Quia fœdus conditiones mutuas fuisset habiturum, quas si altera pars non præstet, fœdus est irritum: Testamentum verò, liberalitatis & gratiæ citra ullam conditionem instrumentum est, ex quo hæredes vocantur & instituuntur citra contemplationem ullius officii quod ab ipsis proficisci possit.*

the

the limitation of it out of the Types and ſhadows of the Law in the fifteenth, and following verſes when he ſhews that the grace of God, was herein more eminent and conſpicuous, in that he gave unto his, not a covenant, but a Teſtament, giving in his reaſons; becauſe a covenant muſt have contained mutual conditions, which if either part did not performe, the covenant were void; but a Teſtament is an inſtrument of liberality and bounty, by which men are called and made heirs without eying of any duty that is to be done by them. Here by the way we ſee that in caſe it be a covenant (according to him) it hath mutual conditions, and therefore he is (together with *Ravanellus*, *Gomarus*, *Urſinus* before quoted, to whom may be added *Peter Martyr* on *Judg.* 2. giving the like definition) wholly againſt thoſe who make this inference; *That it cannot be proved to be of the general nature of covenants, that there ſhould be ſuch a convertibility, as that both muſt ſeal or contract or perform.* But for his poſition that God hath not given a covenant to his people, I wonder how it ſlipt from him; Such unwary expreſſions (in a ſeeming tendency to advance grace from pious perſons) have made way for ſtrange ſuperſtructions. He might have ſaid, that thoſe Types and Shadows of the Law, did argue it to be more then a bare and common covenant, being ratified by blood, which led to the blood of the Mediatour. And ſo *Rivet* (as I underſtand him) anſwers, [g] *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Hebr.* (ſaith he) chap. 9. *doth not argue from the ſimple ſignification of the word, but from the circumſtances of the covenant.* But his denying it to be a covenant, is that which I muſt oppoſe. He is large indeed to ſhew in what latitude the word *Berith* in ſome Old Teſtament-Texts is uſed, as alſo the Latine word *Fœdus* in prophane Authors; All of which, ſhews no more but that the word in the exact denotation and largeſt ſenſe of it imports no more then an ordination or diſpoſition, yet that hinders not, but that as, Interpreters generally render it, ſo, the received and accuſtomed uſe of it, is, to hold out a covenant, bargaine, or agreement. As the word ἐκκλησία, in its largeſt ſenſe, comprizes any Aſſembly, even for civil uſes, *Acts* 19.39. yea, rude congregated routs, *verſe* 41. yet in the generally received ſenſe, it is taken for holy Aſſemblies; So, it is with *Berith*; the word may admit of a large ſenſe, but the received ſenſe is with more reſtriction. The Jews had their covenants, man with man, *Abraham* with *Abimelech*,

[g] *Non hoc voluit Paulus in Epiſtola ad Hebræos*, cap. 9 *ex ſimplici vocis ſignificatione arguere, ſed ex ipſius fœderis circumſtantiis.*

melech, Gen. 21.72. *Isaac* with *Abimelech*, Gen. 26. 28. *Laban* with *Jacob*, Gen. 31.44. And this was the word whereby they did expresse their covenants, And as, the word Church is sometimes used improperly, for Church Members that make not up a whole Church, *The Church in* Aquila *and* Priscilla's *house*, Rom. 16. 5. Sometimes for Church-officers, *Matth.* 18.17. *Tell it to the Church*, who could not be the whole Church whereof infants are a part, or (as all must confesse) women, who yet are no competent judges: so, there are improper acceptions of the word covenant, when the proper sense is that, which hath been held out, which is a mutual compact or agreement on terms and Propositions. The learned observe that συνθήκη properly answers to the word *Berith*; *Ravanellus* observes out of *Hierome*, that *Aquila* and *Symmachus*, did so translate it; and *Rivet* on *Genes. Exercit.* 135. saith, [h] *That which the Septuagint and* Theodotio *call* διαθήκη, *that*, Symmachus *translates* συνθήκη, *pactum*, *fœdus*, which (saith he) *is the proper signification of the Hebrew word* Berith, *which word is not read in the Old Testament, for the ordering of a mans Will or Testament*. Now it is not denyed, but the word *fœdus* and *pactum* in Latine, συνθήκη in Greek, *covenant* in English, do signifie mutual contracts, in which there are mutual performances; and so the Hebrew word *Berith* in like manner; this being according to the learned the genuine signification of it. And if this were not the received signification of it, how did the Objection before mentioned ever come into any mans head, that the Apostle did bewray ignorance in the Scripture-use of the word, in applying it to a mans Will or Testament, and what needed so much pains for his defence in it? *Hierome* on those words, *Gal* 3.17. *This I say, that the Testament confirmed of God*, saith, *If any compare the Hebrew volumes and other Editions with the translation of the Septuagint, he shall find, that, where Testament is written, it doth not signifie a Testament, but a Covenant, which in the Hebrew tongue is called* Berith. And in case Gods whole dispensations and Gospel-communications (as *Junius* would have it) be a Testament onely, and no covenant; why is the world so abused with the word *fœdus, pactum* in Latine, covenant in English? By which all men understand that which we call a covenant, no man understands a Testament; why do we say covenant of Works, covenant of grace, if the for-

h *Quod Lxx. & Theodotio* διαθήκλω *dixerunt Symmachus* συνθήκλω, *hoc est pactum, vel fœdus vertit, quæ est propria significatio Hebraicæ vocis Berith. Quæ vox non legitur in V. T. pro dispositione Testamentariâ.*

former onely were a covenant properly, and the other a Teſtament? as though we ſhould cal, an Eagle, and a Lion both by the common name of a bird, perſwading that a Lion were a bird, as well as an Eagle? yet if it were a Teſtament properly ſo called, it would not overthrow the conditionality, as Mr. *Grayl* out of *Swynborn* ſhews. Teſtaments have their conditions, How comes it to paſs that Scripture holds out ſo frequently that ſimilitude of a marriage, *Iſ.* 54.5. *Hoſ.* 2.19. 2*Cor.* 11.2. *Eph.* 5.32. to ſet out this tranſaction? A marriage contract is not a mans Teſtament: hath a wife barely a Legacie, and doth ſhe enter no covenant with her husband? How comes it to paſſe that turning aſide from God, after other lovers, is called in Scripture by the name of whoredomes, adulteries, which is the breach of a marriage-covenant? and how is ſin againſt God, called a dealing falſely with God? we cannot deale falſely in the covenant, if it be not a covenant, but a Teſtament; men may carry themſelves unthankfully, but falſehood argues an engagement. How is it that we finde, in Old and New Teſtament-Scriptures, mutuall engagements, between God and his people, of God to them, of them to him, in caſe God hath vouchſafed them a Legacie by Teſtament, in the death of his Son, and left them out of covenant? And how is that, without Covenant, without Chriſt, without God, without Hope, with the Apoſtle are one and the ſame, when yet all people that have hope in Chriſt are out of covenant? There be that ſay, *The holy Writers do illuſtrate the New covenant, rather by the Metaphor of a Teſtament, then a covenant.* Theſe ſeeme to make it neither a Covenant nor a Teſtament. Every one knows that a Metaphor is a figure, whereby a word is carried out of its proper ſignification into ſome other that carries reſemblance with it. In caſe there be a metaphor in that expreſſion, then it is not proper, but borrowed; But as I beleeve that *Abraham* ſpake not by a Metaphor to God, when he ſaid, *Gen.* 18.25. *Shall not the Judge of all the world do right?* God abſolving and and condemning the ſons of men, giving rewards, and inflicting penalties, is a Judge properly ſo called; ſo I do not think that God ſpake in any Metaphor to *Abraham*, when in the chapter before, *Gen.* 17.7. he ſaith, *I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee.* God is a Judge of all the earth, properly ſo called, and he hath entred a covenant with his people, properly ſo called likewiſe. It is true, that we un-

derſtand, that relation of God to his people, more clearly by the Analogy that it bears to Judges, that are ſet up among men, for abſolution of the innocent, & condemning of the guilty, And ſo we are holpen in our underſtandings of the covenant of God entred with his people, by Analogy with the covenants, that are among men; but, in neither of both of theſe, is the word taken out of its proper ſenſe, and applyed to any other, that it will not properly bear. I finde indeed an eminent Divine affirming, *That a covenant is not ſo properly ſaid, to be with God and man, as between man and man*, not denying the duty, which man owes to God, nor the engagement by which he is obliged, but freely yeelding both; and ſticking only at the conſent on mans part, *which among men* (he ſayes) *is requiſite, and doth mutually concur to make the covenant valid. But neither in the covenant of nature, or grace, is this conſent anteceding the validity of the covenant required in man.* This I confeſſe I am not able to reach. Nothing with me is more plain, then that, conſent is pre-required in both theſe covenants: *Adam*, I confeſſe, (as it is objected) was bound to conſent, yea, I will yeeld more, that it is no more poſſible to conceive *Adam* to deny conſent, then the Sunne to be without light; ſeeing in his natural motion he was carried in that way of full conformity to God, that the Sun may as well be dark, as *Adam* averſe from the will or tender of God; yet if we could conceive a dark Sunne, it could not be a light to rule the day; ſo if we could conceive *Adam* denying conſent to God, the tender of covenant, *Adam* had not been in covenant. For fallen man it is clear; what held the Phariſees out of the New covenant, but their non-conſent? rejecting the counſel of God againſt themſelves, *Luk* 7.30. as alſo thoſe Jews, *Act.* 13. who contradicting and blaſpheming, *judged themſelves unworthy of eternal life.*

The covenant was tendered to all thoſe Gentile Nations, and Cities where the Goſpel was preached, and all were bound to yeeld aſſent, but where there was aſſent of faith, there the covenant was entered; where aſſent is denied, there they remained, ſtrangers from the covenants of promiſe, in the ſame way of Gentiliſme, as though the Goſpel had never been tendered, or the Name of Chriſt held forth. So that theſe things conſidered, I doubt not but I have made it appear, *That there is a mutual contract, and mutual performances to which perſons are engaged, not only uſually in covenants, but in all covenants.* And that *it is of the general na-*

ture of covenants, that there ſhould be ſuch a convertibility, as that both muſt, if not ſeal, (ſome contracts are without ſeals *) yet contract, or performe, and where a ſeal is vouchſafed, muſt accept of it*: and that the definition of the covenant in the general is vindicated, *That God hath entred a covenant properly ſo called, with man, with fallen man, in which there is a contract of this nature, and engagements to mutual performances, God condeſcending to it of grace, and man obliged to it by duty, yet accepting voluntarily.* Which (as the former) might be confirmed by the authority of Divines of eminency. Mr. *Ball* ſpeaking of the covenant of God in the general entred with man, ſaith, It may be thus deſcribed. *A mutual compact or agreement betwixt God and man, whereby God promiſeth all good things, ſpecially eternal happineſſe unto man, upon juſt, equal, and favourable conditions: and man doth promiſe to walk before God in all acceptable, free, and willing obedience, expecting all good from God, and happineſſe in God, according to his promiſe, for the praiſe and glory of his great Name.* And *Urſin* in his Catechiſme, page 91. defining a covenant in the general nature of it as before, he ſaith, it is [i] *A mutual agreement between God and man, whereby God confirmes to man that he will be merciful, forgive their ſinnes, give them a new righteouſneſſe, his holy Spirit and everlaſting life, in and by his ſon the Mediatour: In like manner men tie themſelves to God for faith and repentance, that is, by a lively faith to receive this mercy alone, and to yeeld true obedience to God.* And *Lucas Trelcatius in loco de fœdere* thus defines it. [k] *The covenant is an agreement to God with man, concerning eternal happineſſe to be communicated to man, upon a certain condition, to the glory of God.* And then explaining himſelf he ſays, *When we ſay an agreement, we underſtand a mutual obligation of God and man, by a ſtipulation intervening, that what is promiſed on both parts, may be performed.* And farther ſaith, *There are two parties of the covenant. 1. The promiſe of God concerning everlaſting life. 2. The obligation of man*

i *Fœdus Dei eſt mutua pactio inter Deum & homines, quâ Deus confirmat hominibus ſe futurum eis propitium, remiſſurum peccata, donaturum juſtitiam novam, Spiritum Sanctum, & vitam æternam per & propter Filium Mediatorem; viciſſim homines ſe obligant Deo ad fidem & pœnetentiam, hoc eſt, ad recipiendum verâ fide hoc tantum beneficium, & ad præſtandam Deo veram obedientiam.*

k *Fœdus eſt pactum Dei cum homine, de fœlicitate æterna, certâ conditione ei communicanda ad Dei gloriam. Pactum cùm dicimus, intelligimus mutuam Dei & hominis obligationem, ex ſtipulatione intervenientem, ut utrimque reddatur quod promiſſum eſt. Duæ ergo ſunt partes fœderis. 1. Promiſſio Dei de vita æterna. 2. Obligatio hominis ad obſervationem conditionis a Deo præſcripta. Prima eſt libera; ſecunda eſt neceſſaria.*

for performance of the condition prescribed of God; the first is free, the second is necessary. And in conclusion, such a bottome I believe is laid in the Introduction, that will bear the whole fabrick that follows after. *Junius* and *Gomarus*, are as opposite as may be, one to the other in this dispute about the covenant, as may be seen in the Appendix to the first chapter: But they both agree in this, that every covenant of necessity is to have mutual engagements and performances. *Gomarus* denies that the promise, *Gen.* 3.15. containes the covenant of grace, because no conditions are there mentioned. And *Junius* to avoid conditions, denies that there is any such thing as a covenant between God and man, for if it were a covenant, he sayes it must have conditions. Therefore according to them both, if we grant a covenant, we must grant conditions, and the full nature of the covenant, is in no Scripture laid down, where we have not these engagements, or conditions, laid down likewise. Some think to reconcile all this by the various acception of the word. *Sometimes it is so used in Scripture, that the free promise of God is thereby signified, and the restipulation of our duty with it, God requiring man to engage by covenant to that which he might require, did there no promise intervene; yet sometimes in Scripture, covenant doth signifie the absolute promise of God, without any restipulation, and of this kinde is that covenant in which God promiseth to give to his elect faith and perseverance, to which promise there cannot be conceived any condition to be annexed, which is not comprehended in the promise it self.* So Learned *Camero de triplici fœdere*, Thes. 1.2. For this absolute covenant here spoke to, I desire the Reader to observe what the same learned Authour hath farther in his third Thesis. *This distinction of the Covenant, doth depend upon the distinction of the love of God; for there is a love of God to the Creature, from whence every thing that is good in the creature hath wholly flowed; and there is the acquiescent love of God in the creature, and this the creature hath received, not for any thing from it self, but from God, as it was loved with that first love of God: that love, for better understanding, we call Gods primary or antecedent; this Gods secondary or consequent love: from that we say, doth depend both the paction, and fulfilling of the absolute covenant, from this depends the fulfilling of that covenant; to which is annexed a restipulation, not so the paction, for that we say depends on the first love.* This antecedent love is wont to be called

called *Amor benevolentiæ*, which can be no more then a purpose or resolution in God for good to man. The second is wont to be called *Amor complacentiæ*, a love of delight, or content. How the former can be a covenant, or any covenant properly so called depend upon it, as preceding the latter, I do not see.

First, this goes before the giving of Christ; the gift of Christ is an effect of it, *Joh.*3.16. Now God covenants not with man, without the Mediator as *Camero* himself acknowledges; and therefore this that precedes, can be no covenant made.

Secondly, a covenant plainly argues an agreement, at least in tender from one, and professed acceptation from the other party. A covenant of parties at a distance, either party holding his distance, respective to that where the distance is held, is the greatest absurdity. Now in this absolute covenant (as it is called) there is not so much as a tender from God, much lesse an acceptance from man, and so, as yet a distance held, and therefore no covenant or agreement.

Thirdly, this supposed absolute covenant, *Jer.*31.33. *Heb.*8.10. hath mercies of two sorts; graces, priviledges; And though men contend that the promise of grace is absolute, seeing there is nothing pre-required of us, for the writing of this Law in our hearts, yet the priviledge of remission of sins hath its conditions, *Act.* 10. 43. *Act.*13.38,39. *Act.*3.19.

Fourthly, none can claim any intereſt in, or take any comfort from, this absolute covenant, depending on the antecedent love of God, preceding the conditional covenant, depending on the consequent love of God: before he hath entered the second which is conditional, and performed the conditions, and knows that he hath performed them. This is clear, it is made, all say, with the Elect; now none can claime his intereſt till he knows his Election, which is made sure only, by our faith, and new obedience, by the knowledge that we have of our faith and new obedience. But it is enough to me that a covenant comprizing a restipulation of our duty, is here confest, which is the Gospel-way to salvation, without which, the acquiescent love of God is not attained. As to that Text, *Heb.* 8.10. the Reader may see more elsewhere.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Further Objections againſt the former doctrine Anſwered.

Further obiections againſt the conditionality of the Covenant anſwered.

THe covenant of grace entred with fallen man (ſaith one) *is called an everlaſting covenant*, and Heb. 8. 12. God ſaith, *I will be merciful to your iniquities, and your ſinnes will I remember no more. Now ſuppoſe there were conditions for man to performe, and man did faile in thoſe conditions, what were become of the covenant?*

Anſ. The conditions failing of the covenant is broke, the everlaſting covenant is broke, which though it ſeeme a contradiction to ſome, yet it is not ſo to the Prophet, *Iſ.* 24. 5. *They have tranſgreſſed the Law, changed the Ordinances, and broken the everlaſting Covenant.* It is ſaid to be everlaſting, becauſe it ſhall not be antiquated for another to ſucceed it, or at leaſt that man is not to put a period to it, ſo Circumciſion and the Paſſeover are Ordinances for ever, not that non-entring into it never break or tranſgreſſe it; The Elect of God Regenerate, do indeed keep covenant, ſo do not all that enter into it. There are frequent Scripture-complaints of Breach of covenant.

Secondly, *It is ſaid, Man hath no tie upon him, to perform any thing whatſoever with covenant, as a condition that muſt be obſerved on his part, let the covenant it ſelf be judge in this caſe; mark it in* Jeremy, Ezekiel, *or in* Heb. 8.

Anſw. In thoſe Texts there are graces mentioned; as Gods work on the ſoule, and priviledges promiſed to be enjoyed. Whatſoever is there ſet forth, as Gods work upon the ſoul, is alſo required of man as duty, namely to *be renued in the ſpirit of his mind*, Eph. 4. 23. *To make him a new heart, and a new ſpirit*, Ezek. 18. 31. *That the Word of Chriſt dwell in him richly in all wiſdome*, Col. 3. 16. It will be hard for any to point out a promiſe of this nature, but it may be anſwered with a command, as an obligation unto duty; As the precepts muſt not thruſt out the promiſe, nor duty ſhoulder out free grace, So, the

the promise must not destroy the precept; In that of *Jeremy*, conditions on mans part are included, so as by the assistance of grace to be performed. The tie lies upon us, on pain of losse of all that the covenant promiseth, and bearing all that it threatneth.

Thirdly, *Suppose* (saith one) *there should be a fault, of performing in this Covenant, whose were the fault?*

Answ. The fault is his, who is chidden in Scripture, and beaten for it, namely those *that did flatter God with their mouth, and lied unto him with their tongues, whose heart was not right with him, nor were stedfast in his covenant*, Ps. 78. 36, 37. They, *upon whom he will bring a sword to avenge the quarrel of his covenant*, Lev. 26. 25. are in the fault.

Fourthly, *if there be conditions, then the covenant is not free, gifts must be of absolute grace and bounty, if a condition be required, the freedome of the gift is destroyed.*

Answ. This is true of such conditions, where there is merit in the condition, whereby benefit accrues to him, that engages by promise, holding proportion with the reward; But, here is nothing indented by way of covenant, but that homage which is naturally due, which God may challenge from us as creatures; without either engagement unto, or exhibition of any reward at all for their paines, and what he may require without reward, when he covenants for it, the reward is free. If *Abraham* had made *Eliezer* of *Damascus* his heir, upon his faithful service, the inheritance had yet been a free gift, and of grace conferr'd upon him. Make the Proposition universal, All conditions in promises destroy the nature of a gift in the thing promised, and then it is to be denied, A covenant of grace would then be a contradiction, seeing it is no covenant, (as hath been demonstrated) without a condition. Then the Prophet doth contradict himself in the tender of a covenant, in the most free manner as is possible, *Isa.* 55. 1, 2. *Ho, every one that thirsteth, &c.* even their conditions are required; *Incline your ear, and come unto me, Hear and your soul shall live; Let the wicked forsake his way, the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and unto our God, for he will abundantly pardon*, Here are free promises with conditions; Men, who have not that sovereignty, account their gifts free, and yet require conditions from them on whom they

CHAP. IX.

Further Objections againſt the former doctrine Anſwered.

Further objections againſt the conditionality of the Covenant anſwered.

*THe covenant of grace entred with fallen man (*ſaith one*) is called an everlaſting covenant,* and Heb. 8. 12. God ſaith, *I will be merciful to your iniquities, and your ſinnes will I remember no more. Now ſuppoſe there were conditions for man to performe, and man did faile in thoſe conditions, what were become of the covenant?*

Anſ. The conditions failing of the covenant is broke, the everlaſting covenant is broke, which though it ſeeme a contradiction to ſome, yet it is not ſo to the Prophet, *Iſ.* 24. 5. *They have tranſgreſſed the Law, changed the Ordinances, and broken the everlaſting Covenant.* It is ſaid to be everlaſting, becauſe it ſhall not be antiquated for another to ſucceed it, or at leaſt that man is not to put a period to it, ſo Circumciſion and the Paſſeover are Ordinances for ever, not that non-entring into it never break or tranſgreſſe it; The Elect of God Regenerate, do indeed keep covenant; ſo do not all that enter into it. There are frequent Scripture-complaints of Breach of covenant.

Secondly, *It is ſaid, Man hath no tie upon him, to perform any thing whatſoever with covenant, as a condition that muſt be obſerved on his part, let the covenant it ſelf be judge in this caſe; mark it in* Jeremy, Ezekiel, *or in* Heb. 8.

Anſw. In thoſe Texts there are graces mentioned; as Gods work on the ſoule, and priviledges promiſed to be enjoyed. Whatſoever is there ſet forth, as Gods work upon the ſoul, is alſo required of man as duty, namely to *be renued in the ſpirit of his mind,* Eph. 4. 23. *To make him a new heart, and a new ſpirit,* Ezek. 18. 31. *That the Word of Chriſt dwell in him richly in all wiſdome,* Col. 3. 16. It will be hard for any to point out a promiſe of this nature, but it may be anſwered with a command, as an obligation unto duty; As the precepts muſt not thruſt out the promiſe, nor duty ſhoulder out free grace, So,

the

the promiſe muſt not deſtroy the precept; In that of *Jeremy*, conditions on mans part are included, ſo as by the aſſiſtance of grace to be performed. The tie lies upon us, on pain of loſſe of all that the covenant promiſeth, and bearing all that it threatneth.

Thirdly, *Suppoſe* (ſaith one) *there ſhould be a fault, of performing in this Covenant, whoſe were the fault?*

Anſw. The fault is his, who is chidden in Scripture, and beaten for it, namely thoſe *that did flatter God with their mouth, and lied unto him with their tongues, whoſe heart was not right with him, nor were ſtedfaſt in his covenant*, Pſ. 78. 36, 37. They, *upon whom he will bring a ſword to avenge the quarrel of his covenant*, Lev. 26. 25. are in the fault.

Fourthly, *if there be conditions, then the covenant is not free, gifts muſt be of abſolute grace and bounty, if a condition be required, the freedome of the gift is deſtroyed.*

Anſw. This is true of ſuch conditions, where there is merit in the condition, whereby benefit accrues to him, that engages by promiſe, holding proportion with the reward; But, here is nothing indented by way of covenant, but that homage which is naturally due, which God may challenge from us as creatures, without either engagement unto, or exhibition of any reward at all for their paines, and what he may require without reward, when he covenants for it, the reward is free. If *Abraham* had made *Eliezer* of *Damaſcus* his heir, upon his faithful ſervice, the inheritance had yet been a free gift, and of grace conferr'd upon him. Make the Propoſition univerſal, All conditions in promiſes deſtroy the [illegible] ture of a gift in the thing promiſed, and then it is to be [illegible] covenant of grace would then be a contradiction, ſeeing it [illegible] covenant, (as hath been demonſtrated) [illegible] the Prophet doth contradict himſelf [illegible] in the moſt free manner as is poſſi[ble] *that thirſteth, &c.* even their con[ditions] *your ear, and come unto me, Hear* [illegible] *wicked forſake his way, the* [illegible] *return unto the Lord, and he* [will] *our God, for he will* [abundantly] with conditions; Men, who [give] gifts free, and yet require [illegible]

are conferred. An Alms-house is founded, and endowed with revenue, conditions are put upon the Almes-people, to reside in such an house assigned, to wear clothes of the colour and forme prescribed, or whatsoever else the Founder please, and yet the gift is free. Finally, God cannot covenant with man, and keep up his sovereignty, if we leave out obedience in the Articles of the covenant. The covenant is upon equal termes, if subjection be excluded; to be a God in covenant, and not require subjection, is the highest of contradictions.

A Learned Writer, after a large discourse held of the right that Redeemed ones have to the death of Christ before beleeving, saith, *Here may be observed the mistake of those who, winde up the merit of Christ, as affecting God (as I may so speak,) unto a conditional engagement,* viz. *that we shall be made partakers of the fruits of it, upon such and such conditions to be by us fulfilled.* It will be worth our labour to enquire what is meant by the conditional engagement, unto which he says some winde up the merit of Christ, as affecting God with it; doth he mean such conditions, that as causes or impulsive motives take with God to enter such engagement? If this be the meaning, I shall freely yeeld that there is no such conditional covenant, that there is no such condition in any Covenant of God with man. In this sense Master *Culverwell* in his Treatise of Faith, *page* 143. takes it, Having mentioned several conditional promises, (in which faith is expressely required, and such wherein it is necessarily understood) he saith, *In all which, faith is necessarily understood, for the obtaining of the benefit promised. But yet in all these, faith, is no condition properly so called, moving God to promise life.* But taking it, in this restrained sense, as moving God to promise life, he much mistakes himself, where he saith, *That it confounds the Law and the Gospel, taking away a chief difference between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, page* 141. Seeing there was no condition, thus understood in the covenant of works; There was not any such good, accruing to God by any thing that *Adam* was to do, that upon it, or for it, God should make the promise of life. God hath no motives out of himself, to confer his rewards, Conditions taken in such a sense, will make the covenant of grace, and the covenant of works all unconditional. But taking the word [condition] in the sense, as it is in

ordin. dented

ordinary use, and as it properly signifies, for duty in covenant indented, agreed upon, and assented to, on performance, or neglect of which, the promise stands or falls, it is plain that there are such conditions in both covenants, equally, in one as the other. The necessity of the concurrence of grace to the work of faith, will as soon make it no duty as no condition, and many denying the one, have learnt to deny either of both, as well duties, as conditions. Mr. *Culverwel* therefore confesseth, that, faith in some sort may be called a condition, because the promise of life is made to persons qualified with faith, *page* 143. and this conditional promise well understood (saith he) *page* 141. may be born. And if understood, with such a restraint as the word will not suffer (we confesse) Christians must not acknowledge it. This being premised, let us look into the reasons brought to back the former assertion.

First, *All such conditions, if spiritual blessings, are part of the purchase of the death of Christ, and if not, are no way fit to be conditions of such an attainment.*

Answ. They are so parts of his purchase, that they are also our act. The act of man by the power of God; God gives faith and gives repentance, yet we beleeve and we repent, we may as easily reconcile Christs purchase, with the nature of a condition, as Gods free gift of grace with our duty, If the gift were of grace and no duty required, then there were force in the argument. This ridgidly followed, will disingage man from all obedience to God, seeing all power to obey, is part of the purchase of Christ.

Secondly, *It cannot be made apparent, how any such conditional stipulation can be ascribed to God.*

Answ. We finde such a one in Scripture ascribed to God, no condition can in more plain terms be held out. In case we cannot see how it can be, it were safer to lay our hands on our mouths, and acknowledge our weakness, then to withstand so clear evidence. He is pleased to give his Reasons.

First, saith he, *It leaves no proper place for the merit of Christ.*

Answ. This reason I can by no means reach. Christ may merit, and upon what terms he pleases, confer what he hath merited; Duty in us excludes merit in Christ, as well as conditions imposed upon us. See *Ball* on the covenant, *page* 133.

Secondly, *It is very improperly aſcribed to God, &c. Stipulation, or engagements upon conditions, that are properly ſo, do ſuppoſe him that makes the engagement, to be altogether uncertain of the event thereof, for which the authority of Lawyers is quoted.*

If conditions among men be of ſuch uncertainty, it doth not thence follow, that it is ſo in thoſe conditions which God impoſes, on performance of which he conferres the mercies which he gives in promiſe. If there be ſo much difference between moral hope, and that Chriſtian grace which is wrought by the Spirit, that the one is only poſſible, conjectural, uncertain and doubtful, the other aſſured and never failing; The one often ending in ſhame, The other never making aſhamed; Then there may be a like difference in the conditions aſſigned by man, and thoſe aſſigned by God, Men may be ſtill uncertain, yet God may be aſſured, the event being not left to contingency or the freedome of mans will, (which is ſuppoſed to ſtand in *æquilibrio*,) but determined by the act of grace, which is not hid from him, whoſe hand works it in the hearts of his people. This might ſeem to carry far rather force againſt all conditions in the firſt covenant, which is yet granted to be conditional, which for performance was meerly ſuſpended on mans will, but hath no colour againſt the conditions of the ſecond covenant, which God works of grace as he requires of ſovereignty.

One is pleaſed to ſay, *Surely they are wide (if not very wilde) who affirm that all the ſtipulations on the part of God, upon the death of Chriſt are upon a condition, which himſelf knows to be impoſſible for them to perform, to whom they are made*, which among Wiſe men are always accounted nugatory and null. And may not the like be ſaid of exhortations, promiſes, threats, commands? God as well knows our diſability to anſwer theſe, as to fulfil conditions, yet they are neither wide, nor wilde, that acknowledge ſuch exhortations, promiſes, threats, commands, without abilities in fallen man to anſwer them, farther then the concurrence of grace that is in Chriſt Jeſus ſtrengthens them; There are many more Objections raiſed by others which the Reader may ſee brought in, by Mr. *Grayl* and Mr. *Woodbridge*, and fully anſwered.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

God in the dayes of the Gospel keeps up the power and authority of his Law, The obligation of it is still in force to binde the consciences of beleevers.

THe last Position that I shall premise, is, *That God in his entry of covenant with man in sinne, doth so manifest his free grace, that he still keeps up his Sovereignty; so exalts mercy, that he loseth nothing of his rule and authority*; His chief aime is to exalt the glory of his free grace, and to set out the riches of his great mercy, that so noble a *species*, as that of mankinde might not for ever perish, yet he quits not man of his subjection and obedience. When the Angels fell, some stood, (whether the fallen or persevering number be greater, cannot be determined) but when man fell, mankinde wholly was lost, and unlesse grace save, must everlastingly perish. As some, with the lost Angels must be objects on whom God will glorifie his justice, *Matth.* 25.41. So others, must be vessels of mercy, on whom his free grace shall be seen, to make them as the Angels of heaven. Therefore love is assigned as the alone impulsory motive; *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten sonne*, John 3.16. *God who is rich in mercy, according to the great love, wherewith he loved us, when we were dead in sinne*, Eph. 2.5. Of this, all that expect to be saved by grace, must be tender, that it be not obscured; Gods designe being to advance it, our care must be that it be not lessened. In this exercise of free grace, God yet keeps up authority and rule, power and dominion still is his. Man was made of God subject to a Law and under dominion, having the law written in his heart from the Creation, and he was not divested of it by *Adams* fall, nor yet delivered from it by Christs Redemption. *Corvinus* indeed in his Reply to *Moulin* (cap. 8. sect. 7.) saith, [a] *That men under an obligation to punishment are not under any obligation to obedience. God will not be served by that man that hath violated his Covenant*, giving his reason of this assertion, *To* [b] *be admitted to serve is a token of favour*, which is not vouchsafed (as he sayes) to men under

Mans fall by sin was no disobligation to obedience.

a *Cùm itaque homo jaceret sub maledictione, ad obedientiam amplius non obligabatur quia coli ab eo Deus amplius non volebat.*

b *Nam quòd coli à creatura sua Deus vult favoris est.*

der guilt and wrath. But this is a manifest errour, Mans guilt can never rob God of his Sovereignty, nor yet disingage man from his duty, Standing right with God, he is bound to homage; Under guilt, he is bound both to homage and punishment; and to be admitted to serve is not meerly of favour, but of dominion and power. It was no great favour, that *Israel* in *Egypt* found, in the service of *Pharaoh*; to serve with acceptance is indeed a favour; but necessity, and duty ties all that are under Sovereignty. As man fallen, in right is a subject, though in his demeanour a rebel; So in his regenerate estate still he ows subjection. When God became a Saviour to the Elect of mankind, he did not cease to be a Sovereigne. *The children of a King and Emperour know their father to be their Sovereign*, as by one is well observed. The child of God knows God in Christ to be his Lord; We are redeemed not to licentiousnesse, not to a state of manumission from the command of God, but *to serve in righteousnesse and true holinesse all the dayes of our life*, Luke 1. 74. It can be no part of our Christian freedome to be from under the Sovereignty of heaven. This Sovereignty of God is two wayes held forth unto us. First, in keeping up his commandments, the power and vigour of his precepts. Secondly, in his exercise of discipline in chastisement, and correction. Here I shall assert three things; First, *God in the days of the Gospel, keeps up the power and authority of his Law; the Obligation of it is still in force to binde the consciences of beleevers.* Secondly, *That this Law which God thus keeps up in force, is a perfect and compleat rule to those to whom it is given.* Thirdly, *That this Law binds, as given by the hand of Moses.* As to the first, when I speak thus, of the Obligation of the Law, I hope I scarce need to tell in what sense; I do take the Law, Not in the largest sense, for any doctrine, instruction, or Ordinance of any kinde whatsoever, Men have their Laws and Directories: but I have to deal with the Law of God: Neither do I take it for the whole of the Word of God, all his will revealed in his Word, as it is taken, *Isa.* 2. 3. *The Law shall go forth of* Zion, *and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem.* Nor yet as it is taken for all the Scripture of the Old Testament, as in that Text of the Apostle, *In the Law it is written by men of other tongues, and by other languages I will speak to this people*, 1 Cor. 14. 21. Nor yet for the five books of *Moses*, as it is taken in the words of Christ, *All must be fulfilled*

The Sovereignty of God is held up.
1. In keeping up his commandments.

that

that was written in the Law of Moſes, *Luke* 24.44. Neither do I here underſtand the Ceremonial Law, which ſtood up as a partition between Jew and Gentile, *Epheſ.* 2.14. All that did binde the Jews, and was not of force from God with the Gentiles, is taken off from Chriſtians; There was a confeſſion of guilt; a beaſt needed not to have been ſlain, if they had been innocent; this held them under hopes that there was ſacrifice to take away ſinne, impoſed on the Jewes till the time of reformation, *Heb.* 9. 10. as an Appendix to the firſt Table; fitted to the Jewes ſtate and condition, as a ſhadow of good things to come, *Heb.* 10. 1. Nor yet the judicial Law, given to order the Common-wealth or State of that people, farther then ſo much of it, as was of nature, and then did bind the Gentiles. It is the Moral Law that I meane, that Law which was obligatory, not only to the Jews, but Gentiles, for breach of which they ſuffered, *Levit.* 18.27,28. Neither do I underſtand the Moral Law, as a covenant, upon obſervation of which life was expected and might be claimed. This is utterly inconſiſtent with the Goſpel. *If there had been a Law that could have given life, verily righteouſneſſe had been by the Law*, Gal. 3.21. And this righteouſneſſe giving life, utterly overthrows the Goſpel, *If righteouſneſſe come by the Law, then Chriſt is dead in vain*, Gal. 2.21. In which ſenſe I deny that the Jewes were ever under the Law. The Law was not given as ſuch a covenant as ſhall God willing be ſhewn. So the Moral Law and Ceremonial Law ſhould militate one againſt another. The Moral Law holding them in themſelves, looking for a righteouſneſſe of works, and the Ceremonial Law leading them out of themſelves, unto a ſacrifice for remiſſion of ſinne. *Abraham* was under no ſuch covenant, he had the Goſpel preached to him, *Gal.* 3.8. and ſo had the ſeed of *Abraham*. But it ſtill hath the nature of a Law binding to obedience, it is for ever a rule, for the guide of our wayes. That it was once of force, is without queſtion; and above all contradiction, and therefore I need not to multiply Old Teſtament-Scriptures for it; There is no repeale of it, it was never antiquated and aboliſhed; therefore it is of force. Though a Law be urged, yet if a repeal may be pleaded, there is a diſcharge. That it is not repealed, I ſhall ſhew, and further that it is not capable of any repeal. If it be repealed, then either by Chriſt, at his coming in the fleſh; or elſe by his Apoſtles, by commiſſion from

B.

The Law hath a commanding power over beleevers.

from him, after the Spirit was given; But neither Christ in person, nor the Apostles by any commission from him did repeal it, but instead of a repeale, did put a new sanction upon it; Christ indeed as soon as he publickly appeared in the work of redemption, was charged that he came to destroy the Law; But this he did utterly disavow, and men of faith in Christ should believe him, professing that he came not *to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it.*

13. Yea, that there is a greater stability in the Law in every tittle of it in regard of the permanency, then is in heaven and earth, then is in the whole frabrick of the world; And whereas the Scribes and Pharisees were then thought to be the only strict observers of the rule of the Law, and the alone men that kept up the honour of it, Christ asserts a necessity of a higher degree of obedience then the Scribes and Pharisees ever taught or practised, *Except your righteousnesse exceed the righteousnesse of the Scribes and Pharisees, &c.* which must be understood of righteousnesse inherent, in conformity to the Law, as appeares in the precedent words, where Christ holds discourse about the Law, and is more fully confirmed in the words that follow; Christ on this occasion openeth the commandments of the Law, shewing how farre Scribes and Pharisees went in their righteousnesse, how farre we must transcend them if ever we come to the Kingdome of heaven. Neither did the Apostles by any Commission from Christ repeal it, but they add the same sanction to it. *Paul* foreseeing that this very thing would be charged upon him, as it was upon Christ, saith, *Do we make void the Law through faith? yea, we establish* (saith he) *the Law*, Rom 3.31. Our doctrine is a confirmation, and no abolition of it. And both he, and other Apostles frequently in their Epistles, urge precepts of the Moral Law, as in force, and having power and command over men in covenant. *Paul* laying a charge upon children to obey their parents, *Ephes.* 6.1. urges it from the fifth Commandment, which he there sets out with a mark of honour, *as the first Commandment with promise,* and paraphraseth upon the promise, annexed to it, against which children might enter their challenge, if in Gospel-times the Law had lost its commanding power. And requiring obedience from wives to husbands, the Law is quoted for it, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. Having proved the equity of Ministers maintenance by an argument drawn from civil right, and common rules of equity in

three

three particulars, he adds, *Say I these things, or saith not the Law, also the same?* And so quotes a Text of the Law, the Law as delivered by *Moses, for it is written in the Law of* Moses, *Thou shalt not muzzle the Oxe that treadeth out the corn*, 1 Cor. 9. 9. and then cleareth it from an exception that might be taken against it. So *James* 2.8. *If ye fulfil the royal Law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self, ye do well.* The Law is of force in that grand duty, so in other precepts there mentioned, *Do not commit adultery, Do not kill*, verse 11. yea, it is of force in the least duties, *ver.* 10. *He that shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all*, 1 Thes. 4. 7, 8. We have the seventh and eighth Commandment quoted as of force with Christians. As also, *Rom.* 12. 19. *Avenge not your selves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord*, quoting the Law, *Deut.* 32. 35.

Neither is it capable of any repeal, being the Law of nature written in the hearts of heathens, *Rom.* 2. 15. more clearly therefore in the heart of *Adam.* These are of those things that are *prohibita, quia mala*; The transgression of them was forbidden, because evil of their own nature, The Creation standing, the Law could be no other: If no Law had ever been promulged, or given of God to man, yet murder and adultery had been sinne, Christ not changing the Law of Creation, but taking to himself the nature of man, (the same as it was first created) when he came to save man, must of necessity keep on foot that law that was from the beginning stampt upon him; So that we see it is not abolished, but ratified, neither is it in a capacity of abolition. It is confest by a great party, of those, that in this appeare as adversaries, that there is no liberty to sinne in the dayes of the Gospel. There be not many that will avouch the contrary, if they do, they must know that they have the Gospel against them, *that hath in a readinesse to avenge all disobedience*, 2 Cor. 6. 10. The Apostle writes to beleevers, *that they sinne not*, 1 John 2. 1. And this is the definition of sinne, 1 *John* 3. 4. *Sinne is a transgression of the Law.* As for those that say beleevers have no sinne, cannot sinne, it is to little purpose to speak to them, or having any thing to deale with them. If they believe not *John*, they will not beleeve me telling them that *that there is no truth in them*, 1 John 1. 8. He that pleaseth may see a large confirmation of this truth in

B.

Mr. *Burg, Vindiciæ Legis,* and Master *Boltons* Treatise of the true bounds of Christian freedome, *page* 77. to 88. Therefore one much forgets himselfe, who in a Treatise of the two covenants, bespeaks his Reader in these words: *Consider this seriously, that if you be beleevers, and married to Christ, the Law hath no more power over you then a dead husband hath over his relict and living wife*, which he presently interprets of a commanding power, and denies, *that the Law hath any commanding power over a beleever.* Which assertion of his, that it may be the more observed, he puts into his Index: *The Law hath no commanding power over a beleever.*

The same Authour yet says, *that the Law is a discoverer of, and convincer of sinne to beleevers, It is a curb to the pride and presumption of beleevers as well as of unbeleevers*; But if a husband cannot by reason of death command his wife, how can he convince her of her faults, or be a curb or restraint to her? *Job* was in right of command over his wife, as long as he had power of reproof, to tell her of her folly, and to endavour to put a stop to it. In his answer of an objection he yeelds, that *though the Law should be dead to a beleever, and a beleever dead to the Law, yet it doth not thence follow that they should sinne, must sinne, or will sinne*; Upon this supposition I say, there is not in them a capacity of sinne, or possibility of sinning. He further sayes, *There would be no sinne (were it not for a Law) for the Law gives (if I may so terme it) a being to sinne, and therefore is called the strength of sinne, for if a man should swear, covet, or kill, and there should be no Law prohibiting the same, doubtlesse it would not be evil, for the Law makes it evil.* And if the Law hath lost its commanding power, then it can give sinne no more being, yea, it hath lost its own being, power of command being of the essence of it. If the Law, *Thou shalt not kill*, have no power of command, then, I sin not, if I kill. If that Law, *Sweare not at all*, have no power of commanding, then, our RANTERS high oaths, are no more sinnes, then our eating of swines flesh, or our not observing the Feast of the Passeover; *Where there is no Law, there is no transgression*: and a Law antiquated and repealed, that the power of command is gone (as in the Laws before mentioned) is no Law. If he still presse that similitude of the Apostle, that a dead husband hath now power of command, But the Law to a beleever

is a dead husband. Firſt, I ſay, if he will be pleaſed to informe me, how a dead husband rips up his wives faults, how he curbs and keeps her in, (which he confeſſes is the Laws office to a beleever) then I ſhall ſpeedily give an account, how this dead husband retaines power of command. The Argument is as well of force, The dead husband hath no power to diſcover his wives faults, to reſtraine, curb, or keep her in: But the Law is a dead husband to beleevers; Therefore the Law hath no ſuch power. It lies upon him to anſwer this argument to free himſelf from ſelf-contradiction. And I would faine ſee this anſwered, and the other maintained. Secondly, for more full ſatisfaction, I ſay that ſome learned Expoſitors make the huſband in that ſimilitude not to be the Law, but ſinne, which hath its power from the Law. So *Diodati* in his Notes upon the place. *Man ſignifieth ſinne, which hath power from the Law, the woman is our humane nature, and of theſe two, are begotten the depraved errours of ſinne*; So alſo Doctor *Reynolds* in his Treatiſe of Divorce, *page* 37. ſetting out the ſcope of this ſimilitude, thus expreſſeth it, *As a wife her husband being dead, doth lawfully take another, and is not an adultereſſe, in having his company, to bring forth fruit of her body to him; ſo regenerate perſons, their natural corruption (provoked by the Law to ſin) and fleſh being mortified, and joyned to Chriſt as to a ſecond husband.* Maſter *Burges Vindiciæ Legis*, page 218. ſaith, *Sinne which by the Law doth irritate and provoke our corruption, that is the former husband the ſoul had, and luſts they are the children thereof*, and this the rather is to be received, becauſe the Apoſtle in his reddition doth not ſay *the Law is dead, but we are dead.* But if he will ſtill contend that the Law is the husband in that place; which by reaſon of corruption hath ſo much power for irritation and condemnation over an unregenerate man; I ſhall onely give him that advice which Doctor *Reynolds* in the place quoted, gives *Bellarmine*, upon occaſion of his interpretation of this ſimilitude. *Let* Bellarmine *acknowledge that ſimilitudes muſt not be ſet on the rack, nor the drift thereof be ſtreched in ſuch ſort, as if they ought, juſt in length, breadth, and depth, to match and fit that whereunto they are reſembled* And when he confeſſeth power in the Law notwithſtanding this death to performe diverſe offices in the ſouls of beleevers, he cannot affirme that the law is wholly dead, nor deny but that it may have

Rom. 7. 1, &c. vindicated.

this office of command likewise. The power which the Law loseth, is that which corruption gave it, which is irritation and condemnation; Corruption never gave command to the Law, and the death of corruption, through the Spirit, can never exempt the soul from obedience, or take the power of command from it. Let it be granted that the Law is the husband here mentioned, the similitude is this. That as the Law through our corruption was fruitful in mans nature to the bringing forth of sinne and condemnation, So Christ by the Spirit is to be fruitful in our nature to bring forth works of grace to salvation, and so the death of the Law is meerly in respect of irritation, or inflaming to sinne; and binding over to condemnation, not in respect of command. That this is the full and clear scope of this similitude, beyond which it must not be stretched, plainly appeares, *verse 5. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sinnes which were by the Law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.* So that here is nothing against the commanding power of the Law: God still keeps up his Sovereignty, and by this Law he rules the regenerate. I wish our Authour would sadly reflect upon that reason of his, *The Law is not authorized by Christ to reigne and rule in the consciences of his people, For his Fathers peace, his own righteousnesse, and his Spirits joy.* There is none that speaks of the reigne of the Law in the consciences of the people of God, but God in Christ reigns, and by his Moral Law rules, for all these reasons, So farre are these from excluding his rule, by his Law in his peoples hearts. If this rule of the Law be destructive to Christs righteousnesse, then Christs coming for righteousnesse must needs be to destroy the Law, which Christ disclaimes. And the rule of the peace of God in our hearts, is so farre from excluding his rule by his Law, that without it, it can never be attained, *Great peace have they that love thy Law, and nothing shall offend them,* Psalme 119.165. *This is the confidence that we have in God, that whatsoever we ask according to his will, we shall receive, because we keep his commandments,* 1 John 3.22. A Commandment hath a commanding power, and only they that keep them have this peace ruling in their hearts. The Spirits joy, and the power of the Law to command, are so farre from opposing one the other, that the Spirit gives testimony of Gods abode in no other but such as confesse and yeeld to this power.

NB.

NB.

see Francis Roberts on the Coven. Pag. 730

power. *He that keepeth his Commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him: and hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us,* 1 John 3. 24. And of like nature is that which he further hath, *Though the Law (the former husband) be dead to a beleever, yet a beleever is no widow, much lesse an harlot; for he is married to Christ, and is under the Law of Christ, which is love.* If the moral Law respective to the power of command be dead, then love is dead with it. *Jesus Christ reduces the ten Commandments into two: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self.* If then the Law be dead, this love from the heart is dead, and so a beleever is either a widow or an harlot. Master *Burges, Vindiciæ Legis,* page 12. shews at large that *to do a thing out of obedience to the Law, and yet by love and delight, do not oppose one another,* which if the Reader consult with his enlargement of it, he shall need to go no farther for refutation, nor his own satisfaction. Men are wont to expect in children and servants (much more in wives) both love and obedience: If this rule hold, they must quit the one, and cleave to the other; Either they must take to love, without obedience, or obedience without love. These two which cannot be severed (if ye love and keep my Commandments) this Divinity makes inconsistent. *God gave Laws* (saith our Authour) *to man to declare his own Sovereignty, and his creatures duty.* And we must tell him, that to keep up his Sovereignty, and his creatures duty, he continues his Law. They that take power of command from it, divest him of his Sovereignty, and exempt the creature from duty. I know there are many evasions, if it might be to shuffle off, and evade this doctrine; if not wholly denying the Law, yet weakening the power of it in Gospel-time.

Some say, *that it bindes us as creatures, but not as Christians.* And then it is to be feared, that they taking themselves to be above creatures in that they are Christians, being raised in a neerer relation to God, then meer creatures, they will take themselves to be disobliged; But if the creature be cast into hell, for transgression; as a drunkard, an adulterer, a covetous person, what will become of the Christian? But it bindes both as creatures and Christians, Christ having put his sanction upon it.

The Law bindes the whole of man.

Others say, that it bindes the *unregenerate part of man, but not the regenerate part, that is free.* *Paul* delighted in the Law of God after the inward man, *Rom.* 7. 22. That is, as Interpreters understand, so farre as regenerate; How could he delight in it as a Law, and not subject to it? It seems these think that only wicked ones are bound, or rather wickednesse to be alone obliged; It will shortly be a mark of unregeneration (as it seemes it is with some already) to be subject to it; They that urge it upon men, and presse it as their duty, have the name of legal Preachers, and strangers from Gospel-mysteries put upon them. It is a wearisome thing to rake further in this puddle; I hope it is plain in that which hath been said, that God holds up this part of his Sovereignty in keeping up his commandment, the authority of his Moral Precepts in the hearts of his people.

CHAP. XI.

The Moral Law is a perfect Rule of Righteousnesse.

AS God keeps up his Law for a Rule to his people, so it is a perfect and a compleat Rule to those to whom it is given. This is a doctrine unanimously, heretofore maintained by Protestant Writers, but opposed by *Papists*, *Arminians*, and *Socinians*. Papists have their traditions, added, as well to the Law, as to the Gospel, which is an accusation of the written Law, as imperfect: They have also their Evangelical counsels, which though they are not commanded, yet (as *Bellarmine* speaks) are commended, as raising Christians to an higher perfection, then ever the Law required. *Socinians* (with whom many *Arminians* joyne) affirme, that Christ hath instituted new precepts of obedience in the Gospel; and added them to the commands of the Law, such as transcend and exceed all that were delivered in Old Testament times. *Gerrard* having disputed for the perfection of the Law against *Papists*, cap. 14. *De Evangelio*, saith, *The Popish*

Popish opinion of new Laws promulgated by Christ, the Photinians (which is an other name of *Socinians*) *greedily embrace*; *making a fair way for* Mahometisme, *seeing that in the* Alcoran *it is in like manner said, That* Moses *gave a Law, lesse perfect,* Christ *more perfect, and* Mahomet *most perfect of all.* *Gerrard* quotes this passage out of the *Cracovian* Chatechisme in the same chapter. *Christ came not only to fulfil the Law for us, but added new precepts to it. These new precepts,* (the same Authour saith) *they make twofold: Some of which do appertain to manners, some to ceremonies, or outward rites in worship.* He names three that appertaine to manners: *To deny a mans self; take up his Crosse, and follow Christ*: Which three precepts my Authour in way of opposition saith, *belong to the first commandment.* *Peltius* in his Harmony of *Arminians* and *Socinians*, chap. 4, 5, 6. sheweth their combination against the Orthodox party, as in many other things, so in this proposition now controverted. He there quotes from *Socinians* these positions: *That Christ in the New Testament did not only abrogate the Ceremonial and Judicial Law, but did much encrease and adde unto the Moral Law: That he came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it; which fulfilling* (saith he) *is nothing else but a perfecting of it, and addition of what was wanting: That we ought not only to observe those things that are given us of God, and not abrogated by Christ, but those precepts in like manner that are added by Christ.* Much more from many *Socinians*, and *Arminians*, may be seen in that Authour to that purpose. Dr. *Hammond* in his Practical Catechisme, speaking of Christs Sermon in the Mount, agrees indeed with the *Papists*, against the *Protestants*, *That Christ doth not here expound* Moses, *and vindicate the Law from false glosses, but that he addes to the Law*, and names many additions to the sixth, seventh, and other Commandments, but dissents from them, in that they make these Evangelical Counsels, and makes them precepts, not precepts of *Moses*, but of *Christ*, added by him to the Law: but, this with much modesty, as though he would not be peremptory in his opinion. So that * Mr. *Burges*, page 166. handling controversies about the Law, saith, *I shall now handle the perfection of it, and labour to shew that Christ hath instituted no new duty, which was not commanded before by the Law of* Moses. *And this question,* (saith he) *will be profitable, partly against the* Arminians, *partly the* Papists, *and lastly, the* Socinians. He further saith, *page* 169. *That*

M.

* Authorities vouchsafed for the perfection of the Moral Law as a Rule.

That Christ did not adde, new duties which were not commanded in the Law, because the Law is perfect, and they were bound not to add to it, or detract from it, Therefore we are not to conceive a more excellent way of duty, then that prescribed. Further, if we speak of holy and spiritual duties, there cannot be a more excellent way of holinesse this being an Idæa, *and representation of the glorious nature of God.* Dr. *Ames* in his *Sciagraphia*, handling the Decalogue, makes this, his first doctrine, (a) *The Law of God contained in the Decalogue is a most perfect Rule for guidance of the life of man.* He gives foure reasons, with an use of information, (b) *That we esteem this Law as it ought to be esteemed, and that, as the only Rule of our lives, and such a Rule that hath no defect, but is perfect in it self, and requires all perfection in it.* Davenint *de Justit. actual.* cap. 40. pag. 463. saith, (c) *The Law of God it self, is a most exact and perfect Rule of Holinesse and Righteousnesse*: And in the proof of it saith, (d) *This is every where confirmed in Scripture, which wonderfully extols the perfection of the divine Law.* *Downham* in the preface of his Tables of the Commandments saith, that, *The Law of God is perfect, requiring perfect obedience both inward and outward, not only in respect of the parts, but of the degrees.* The *Leyden Professours* say, (e) *The Law is so perfect, that nothing in Moral precepts, either by Christ or his Apostles; as any more exact rule of good works hath been added under the New Testament.* Disp. 18. §. 39. *Ursinus* in his definition of the Moral Law inserts this, (f) *Binding all reasonable creatures to perfect obedience both inward and outward*, page 681. *Chemnitius* entitles his third Chapter *de Lege*, (g) *Of the perfect obedience which the Law requires*, and presently layes down these words, (h) *This Doctrine of the perfect obedience which the Law requires, in all ages past hath been, and is now depraved.* *Bucan* in his common places, page 188. thus defines the Moral Law; (i) *A divine injunction, containing*

(a) *Lex ista Dei quæ in Decalogo continetur est perfectissima regula ad vitam hominis dirigendam.* (b) *Ut legem istam Dei eo loco habeamus quo debemus, i.e. ut non aliter de eadem cogitemus quam ut de vitæ nostræ unica forma & tanquam de illa norma quæ nullum habet defectum sed perfecta est in sese & perfectionem omnem à nobis requirit.* (c) *Ipsa lex Christi est exactissima & perfectissima regula Sanctitatis & justitiæ.*

(d) *Passim in Scripturis confirmatur quæ perfectionem legis divinæ mirificè extollunt.* (e) *Tam perfecta est hæc lex ut nihil ei in præceptis moralibus aut à Christo aut ab Apostolis ipsius additum fuerit quoad exactionem bonorum operum normam sub novo Testamento sit adducta.* (f) *Obligans omnes creaturas rationales ad perfectam obedientiam internam & externam.* (g) *De perfectâ obedientiâ quam Lex requirit.* (h) *Variis autem corruptelis omnibus temporibus, & olim, & nunc depravata est doctrina de perfectâ obedientia, quam Lex Dei requirit.* (i) *Est præceptio divina continens piè justeque coram Deo vivendi regulam, requirens ab omni homine perfectam & perpetuam obedientiam.*

a rule,

a rule to live piously and justly before God, requiring of all men perfect and perpetual obedience towards God. I shall conclude with the Confession presented to both houses of *Parliament*, by the Assembly of Divines, *chap.* 19. 2. *The Law after his* (i. e. Adams) *fall, continued to be a perfect Rule of Righteousnesse, and as such was delivered by God on mount* Sinai *in ten Commandments*; To these more might be added, but these are sufficient to shew the great consent of Protestant Writers.

But I shall not rest barely upon the authority of these testimonies, but also offer to consideration these following Reasons.

Arguments evincing the perfection of the Moral Law.

B. 1. If the Law be not a fully perfect, and compleat Rule of our lives, then there is some sinne against God which is not condemned in the Law, This is clear; Deviation from any rule given of God, is a sin: Deviation from that, supposed additional rule, is a sin; But there is no sin which the Law doth not condemn; *Sin is a transgression of the Law,* 1 John 3,4. *He that sins, transgresseth the Law.*

B. 2. If the Law alone discovers and makes sinne known, then it is a perfect, full, and compleat Rule; this is plain: *Omne rectum index est obliqui.* But the Law alone discovers sinne, *Rom.* 3. 20. This office is ascribed there to the Law, which is no other but the Moral Law. Had not the light of that Rule guided the Apostle in this work, he had never made any such discovery: And it is the moral Law written in the decalogue that he means, as appears in the quotation; *I had not known lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*

3. That which alone works wrath, is the alone Rule and guide of our lives. This is clear, in what sense soever it is, that we take working of wrath: whether we understand it of working of wrath in man against God, as some do; Mans heart being apt to rise against him that will exercise Sovereignty over him, Or of the wrath of God kindled against man, upon transgression of the Law. But it is the Law that works wrath: it is ascribed to it, and it alone, *Rom.* 4. 15.

4. That which being removed will take away all possibility of sinning, that is alone the Rule of our obedience: This is plain; were there any Rule, the transgression of it would be

ſtill our ſinne. But the Law being removed, all poſſibility of ſin is taken away: *Where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion*, Rom. 4. 15.

5. If the Law only addes ſtrength to ſinne, *viz.* for condemnation, then the Law is the alone rule of obedience: This is plaine; Any other Rule whatſoever addes like ſtrength to ſinne, and upon tranſgreſſion will condemne. But the Law only addes ſtrength to ſinne, 1 *Cor.* 15. 56. *The ſtrength of ſin is the Law.*

6. Either the epithite [*moral*] is not juſtly given to the Law, or elſe it is a perfect Rule of manners, that is, of obedience: This is plaine, for moral denotes, as *Ameſius* obſerves, that uſe of it. But this epithite given to the Law, and appropriated to it, was never (as I think) upon any ſuch account challenged. *Ergo.*

7. Either this new Rule doth tranſcend the old Rule of the Moral Law; requiring a more exact degree of perfection, as *Papiſts* ſpeak of their evangelical counſels, and *Socinians* of their additional Goſpel precepts, or elſe it falls ſhort and admits of obedience in a degree more low. If it require obedience more high, then even the doers of the Law, in the greateſt height and poſſible ſuppoſed perfection; though equal to the Angels, are ſinners: The Law might be fulfilled, and yet diſobedience charged. If it fall ſhort of the old Rule (which it ſeemes is the opinion of ſome who confeſſe an imperfection in our perſonal righteouſneſſe, as it refers to the old Rule; and aſſert a perfection, as it relates to the new Rule) then the new Rule allows that which the old Rule condemnes, and ſo they bring in a diſcrepancy between them, and finde an allowance for tranſgreſſion. So that I think, I have ſufficient authourity, divine and humane, with reaſons that are cogent, to conclude that which I have aſſerted, That the old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law, is a perfect Rule, and the only Rule.

(1) Exceptions taken againſt the perfection of the Law, (b) 1. Exception.

Six ſeveral exceptions are taken againſt the (*a*) perfection of this Law, or ſingularity of it, as a rule by a learned hand.

1. It is demanded, *What ſay you for matter of duty, to the poſitive (b) precepts for the Goſpel? of Baptiſm; the Lords day; the Officers and government of the Church, &c? Is the Law of nature the only rule for theſe?* And foreſeeing what would be anſwered as well

well he might, he addes, *If you ſay, they are reducible to the ſecond commandment, I demand,* 1. *What is the ſecond commandment, for the affirmative part, but a general precept to worſhip God, according to his poſitive inſtitution?* 2. *Do ye take the precept* de genere *to be equivalent to the precepts* de ſpeciebus? &c. To this I think I may anſwer out of his own mouth, where he ſayes, *The neglect of Sacraments is a breach of the ſecond commandment.* In caſe we break the commandments in the neglect of them, then the commandment requires the obſervation of them. For which Maſter *Burges* Vindiciæ Legis *page* 149. *Balls* Catechiſme, *Ameſius* his Sciographia, *Dod* on the commandments, *Downhams* Tables, *Zanchy*, each of them on this commandment; and *Cawdry* and *Palmer* on the Sabbath, *Part.* 2. *Pag.* 176. may be conſulted. For further clearing of this point, we muſt conſider of the preceptive part of the Moral Law, which alone in this place is our buſineſſe to enquire after, 1. As it is *epitomized* in the Decalogue, thoſe *ten words*, as *Moſes* calls them, *Exod.* 34.28. Or elſe, as *commented upon*, and more amply delivered in the whole Book of the Law, Prophets, and Scriptures of the New Teſtament. 2. We muſt diſtinguiſh of the manner how the Law preſcribes, or commands any thing as duty, which is either *expreſly*, or *Synecdochically*, either *directly*, or elſe *interpretatively, virtually, and reductively*; I very well know, that the Law is not in all particulars ſo explicitely, and expreſly delivered, but that, 1. The uſe, and beſt improvement of reaſon is required to know, what *pro hic & nunc* is called for at our hands for duty. The Law layes down rules in affirmative precepts, in an indefinite way, which we muſt bring home by particular application, diſcerning by general Scripture Rules, with the help of reaſon (which ſometimes is not ſo eaſie to be done) when it ſpeaks to us in a way of concernment, as to preſent practical obſervation. 2. That hints of providence are to be obſerved, to know what in preſent is duty, as to the affirmative part of the commandment of God. If that man, that fell among theeves, between *Jeruſalem* and *Jericho*, had ſate by the way, on the green graſſe, without any appearance of harme, or preſent need of help, the *Samaritane* that paſſed that way, had not offended, in caſe he had taken no more notice, then the Prieſt and Levite did: But diſcerning

him that case, as he then was, the sixth commandment called for that, which he then did, as a present office of love to his neighbour, according to the interpretation of this commandment given by our Saviour, *Mark* 3. 4. When the Pharisees watched him, whether he would heale the man with the withered hand on the Sabbath day, He demands of them, *Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day, or to do evil, To save life, or to destroy?* It was not their minde that Christ should kill the man, onely they would not have had him, then to have cur'd him: But not to cure when it is in our power, according to Christs interpretation, is to kill. If diligent observation be not made, the commandment may be soone transgress'd. 3. Skill in Sciences, and professions is to be improved by men of skill, that the commandment may be kept. The Samaritane poured wine and oyle into the travellers wounds, knowing that to be of use, to supple and refresh them. Had he known any other thing more sovereigne, which might have been had, at hand; he was to have used it. As skill in medicines is to be used for preservation of mens lives, so also skill in the Laws, by those that are vers'd in them, for the help of their neighbour, in exigents; concerning his estate and livelihood. 4. We must listen to Gods mouth, to learne when he shall be pleased at any time further to manifest his minde for the clearing of our way in any of his precepts. There was a command, concerning the place of publick, and solemn worship, *Deut.* 12. 5. *Unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your Tribes to put his Name there, even to his habitation shall ye seek, and thither shalt thou come*, Now thou must depend on the mouth of God, to observe what place in any of the Tribes; he would choose for his habitation. When God commands, that all instituted worship shall be according to his prescript; This is a perfect Rule implicite, and virtual; tying us to heed the Lord at any time, more particularly discovering his will, and clearing this duty to us. Was not the Law of worship perfect, to *Abraham*, unlesse it explicitely told him that he must sacrifice his Sonne? And if any take themselves to be so acute, as to set up a new Rule, as some are pleased to stile it, then they antiquate and abolish the old Rule, and singularly gratifie the *Antinomian* party. Two Rules will no more stand together

then

then two covenants; calling it a new Rule, men make the first old: Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is *ready to vanish away*, Heb. 8. 17. It is added moreover, *doth not the Scripture call Christ our Lawgiver*, and say the Law shall go out of *Zion*, &c. *Isa.* 2. 3. And was not the old Law his? Saint *Paul*, I am sure, quotes that which belongs to the preceptive part of the Moral Law, and calls it the *Law of Christ*, Gal. 6. 2. His Laws were delivered in the wilderneſſe, whom the people of *Israel* there tempted and provoked; This is plain, for they sinn'd against the Lawgiver, and from his hands they suffered. And who they tempted in the wilderneſſe, see from the Apostles hand, 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. And as to the Scripture quoted, the words are exegetically set down in those that follow them. *The Law shall go out of Zion, and the Word of the Lord out of Jerusalem*: Which is no more, but that the Name of the Lord, which was then known in *Judah*, shall be great from the rising of the Sun, to the going down thereof. It is further demanded, *And is he not the anointed King of the Church, and therfore hath legislative power*? For answer, I desire to know what King the Church had, when the old Law was, before Christ came in the flesh? The Kingdom was one and the same, and the King one and the same then, and now, as I take it. *Many shall come from the East, and West, and shall sit down with* Abraham, Isaac *and* Jacob, *in the kingdom of heaven.* The Gentiles coming in at the Gospel-call, are under the same King, and in the same Kingdom. And if all this were granted which is here pleaded for, it is no more then a change in some positive, circumstantial Rites, and what is this to the question handled by our Authour; *That our righteousneſſe which is imperfect according to the old Rule, is perfect according to the new?* when old and new in that which is naturally Moral, is one and the same. When the Law required heart-service, and love with the whole heart, upon spiritual ends and motives, upon which account all fell short in their obedience, and performance, shall we say that Christ did dispense with any of this, that so the Rule being lower, our obedience now may answer. Others that make *Moses* and Christ two distinct Law-givers and agents for God, in holding out distinct precepts, give the pre-eminence to Christ, and account his Law to be of more eminent perfection. This Authour on the contrary seems to make the Laws of Christ to stoop far beneath those of *Moses*.

2. Exception.

2. For Justification of this accusation of the Moral Law of imperfection, it is added, *the Moral, taken either for the Law given to* Adam, *or written in Tables of stone, is not a sufficient rule for us now, for beleeving in Jesus Christ, no nor the same Law of nature as still in force under Christ. For a general command of beleeving all that God revealeth, is not the only rule of our faith, but the particular revelation and precept are part, &c.* To this I say,

1. As before, I think I may answer out of his own mouth, where he says, *Neglect of Sacraments is a breach of the second commandment, and unbelief is a breach of the first.* If we break the commandment in unbelief, then the Commandment bindes us to believe.

N.B.

2. Much of that which I have spoke by way of answer to the former, may be applied to this likewise.

3. I shall hereafter speak to this, that faith is a duty of the Moral Law, where the Reader may have further satisfaction.

N.B. see P. 96. &c.

4. If *Adam* had no command for faith, then he was not in any capacity to believe, and by his fall lost not power of beleeving: And consequently it will not stand with the Justice of God to exact it at our hands, having never had power for the performance of it.

5. I say, there was power in *Adam*, for that *faith that justified*, but not to *act for justification*. *Adam* had that habit, and the Law calls for it, from all that are under the command of it: But the Gospel discovers the object by which a sinner through faith is justified.

3. Exception.

3. The same answer may serve to the third exception, which indeed is the same with the former, only a great deal of flourishing is bestowed, in discourse of the understanding and will, paralleling them with the Prefaces, grounds and occasions of Laws, not needful to be repeated. And at last bringing all to the Articles of the Creed, to which enough already is spoken.

4. Exception.

4. It is said, *But what if all this had been left out, and you had proved the Moral Law the only Rule of duty? doth it follow therefore that it is the only Rule? Answ.* If the Moral Law be the only Rule of duty, then I take it to be the only Rule; for I enquire after nothing but duty, and I take righteousnesse to be matter of duty, and then the only Rule of duty, is the only Rule of righteousnesse. It is further said, *Sure it is not the only Rule of rewarding.* And I say,

re-

Rewarding is none of our work, but Gods, and I look for a Rule of that work which is ours, and that we are to make our buſineſſe, I confeſſe an imperfection in it, to give life, but aſſert a perfection as the Rule of our lives, It juſtifies no man, but it orders and regulates every juſtified man.

5. It is further ſaid, *The ſame I may ſay of the Rule of puniſhment.* To which I give the ſame anſwer: It is not our work, but Gods, either to reward or puniſh. And here he ſpeaks of a part of the penalty of the new Law, And I know no penalty properly diſtinct from the penalty of the old. He is wont to compare it to an Act of Oblivion, and Acts of Oblivion are not wont to inflict penalties, but ſerve to remove them when another Law impoſes them. That of the Parable is inſtanced, *None of them that were bidden ſhall taſte of the Supper*; when the ſin for which they there ſuffer is a breach of a Moral command. 5. Exception.

6. *It* is ſaid, *The principal thing intended is, that the Moral Law is not the only Rule, what ſhall be the condition of Life or Death, and therefore not the only Rule according to which we muſt now be denominated, and hereafter ſentenced, Juſt or Unjuſt.* To this I have already given a ſufficient anſwer, and if I had not, our Authour anſwers fully for me, where he ſays, *The precepts of the Covenant, as meer precepts, muſt be diſtinguiſhed from the ſame precepts conſidered as conditions, upon performance of which we muſt live, or die for non-performance.* And I ſpeak of them as meer precepts, and ſo they are our Rule of righteouſneſs, & not as they are conditions either of the covenant of works or grace. And a man may be denominated righteous, by the Laws Rule, when he cannot ſtand before the ſentence of it, as a covenant, of which we have heard ſufficient. After a long diſcourſe againſt all poſſibility of juſtification by the Law of works, as though I were therein an adverſary; or that the *Antinomian* fancy were above all anſwer; that a man cannot make the Law his Rule, but he makes it withal his Juſtification, he goes about to prevent an objection, and ſays, *If you ſhould ſay, this is the covenant and not the Law*, he will reply, 1. *Then the Law is not the only Rule.* To which I ſay, When my work is to make it good, that the Law is our only Rule, I marvel that he will ſo much as imagine, that I will ſay that which makes it not the only Rule. But perhaps, he thinks I do not ſee, how it cannot follow, as indeed I do not, neither can I ſee any colour for it. 2. He replies, *It* 6. Exception.

is

is the same thing in several respects, that we call a Law and a Covenant (except you mean it of our covenant-act to God, of which we speak not) who knows not that præmiare, *and* punire *are Acts of a Law? And that an Act of Oblivion or general pardon on certaine termes is a Law, and that the promise is the principal part of the Law of Grace.* To which *I* say, that *præmiare* and *punire* are essential in a Law. Some have power of command, so that their words in just things is to be a Law, where most deny any power of punishment; as an Husband over the Wife. Some parents have Authority to command children, (children remaining under the obligation of the fifth commandment as long as the relation of a childe continueth) when they have neither power to reward or punish. *Jacob* took himself to be in power, to command *Joseph* (among the rest of his Sons, as appears in the charge concerning his burial, *Gen.*47.29,30. and *chap.*49.29. So compared) and yet he was not in power either to reward or punish him. And though they be acts of a law where he that gives the Law is in power; Yet they are no parts of a Rule, nor any directory of life to him to whom they are proposed. *I* know that an Act of Oblivion or general pardon may be called a Law, as many other things are, *catachrestice* and *abusivè*; but that it should be a Law properly so called, *I* know not. The *Romanes* defined a Law, whilest that a *Democratie* was in force among them, to be *Generale jussum populi, aut plebis rogante magistratu.* Afterwards when the State was changed, and the Legislative power was in other hands, they defined it to be, *Jussum Regis aut Imperatoris.* And *Tully's* definition of a Law is, that it is, *Ratio summa insita in natura, quæ recta suadet, prohibetque contraria.* Here *jussio, suasio,* and *prohibitio* are expres'd, which are not found in Acts of Oblivion. That every man, who is within the verge of such an Act, may be said to be acquit by Law, *I* willingly grant; seeing that act takes off the force of the Law condemning him: But that it is a Law, strictly so taken, *I* know not.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

The Moral Law bindes, as it was delivered by the hand of Moſes.

A Third branch of the general Propoſition before delivered follows, which is, *that the Moral Law, as delivered by the hand of* Moſes, *is obligatory to Chriſtians*; This I confeſſe is more diſputable, then either of the former before ſpoken to; In thoſe, we had to deale with *Antinomians*, on the one hand; *Papiſts*, *Arminians*, *Socinians*, on the other hand, with ſome few others that are pleaſed in thoſe points alone to ſtrike in, with *Arminians* and *Socinians*, and in other things to oppoſe them: But in this *Papiſts* agree not among themſelves, but one is againſt another; neither is there that agreement amongſt *Proteſtant* Writers that might be deſired, which muſt not be concealed; ſome are for the affirmative, and ſome for the negative, and ſome ſeem to ſtand in a neutral indifferency. *Bellarmine* among the *Papiſts*, is for the affirmative, *lib.* 4. *de juſtificatione*, *cap.* 6. and takes up *Soto* for the contrary tenent, who affirmes (as he quotes him) that *Chriſtians are not only delivered from the Ceremonial Law, and the guilt and terror of the moral Law, but from the whole Law, as written in the books of* Moſes, with this caution (as he reports him) *that we are to keep the Law of* Moſes *as it is natural, and as it is in the Goſpel, and in the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, but not as it was written by* Moſes; *for* Moſes (ſaith he) *could not binde us, but it is Chriſt that bindes us, for we are Chriſtians and not Jews.* *Soto* hath *Suarez*, and *Medina* (as Maſter *Burges* obſerves) with him, and among the Proteſtants, *Zanchius de redemptione lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. and *Muſculus* in his common places go the ſame way, affirming, *that the Moral Lawes which go under the name of the decalogue, as they were delivered by* Moſes *to the* Iſraelites, *do not concerne Chriſtians, but as they are agreeable to the Law of nature, and confirmed by Chriſt.* *Paræus* (as is obſerved by *Rivet* in his Explication of the Decalogue, page 11.) giving in his judgement of the differing opinions of *Bellarmine* and *Soto*, *affirms* that the opinion

of *Bellarmine* is moſt ſafe to be followed. *Rivet* himſelf, in the place quoted, takes it to be a ſtrife of words; and the difference to be inconſiderable; and in caſe the authority be granted, there ſeemes indeed leſſe danger, though the Miniſter be waved. The Antinomian (as others have obſerved) is by both parties oppoſed; Some may think, that the Law, thus gaines in its authority, in as much, as Chriſt is, of much more excellency then *Moſes*, when the Maſter of the Vineyard, ſaw his ſervant neglected, he ſaid, *They will reverence my Sonne*, Mat. 21. 37. But if the ſervant be once deſpiſed, and ſet ſo light by, as we read from ſome hands, *Away with ſtammering Moſes*, it may be feared, that the Sonne will not long remaine in honour, when ſervants fared ſo ill, we finde that the Sonne had little better entertainment; And, in my thoughts, there is ſcarce a readier way then this, to ſtrip us of the whole of the Law of God. Keeping up to their own principles, they can look on no more, of the Law, as binding Chriſtians, then that which is held out to us, in New Teſtament-Scriptures. If this be granted, we muſt have a New Teſtament Text, for every Moral duty; yet to gratifie adverſaries in this particular, we may ſafely yeeld, that the Law concernes not Chriſtians, as it was delivered by *Moſes*, only to the *Iſraelites*, and ſo *Zanchy's* Poſition, keeping ſtrictly to the termes may happily be defended *The Moral Laws as delivered by* Moſes *to the* Iſraelites *do not appertain to Chriſtians*; ſo, neither doth *Lukes* Goſpel, or the hiſtory of the *Acts*, as from him to *Theophilus*, nor yet, any of *Pauls* Epiſtles, as from him, to any particular Church, or to *Timothy*, *Titus*, or *Philemon*. But looking on *Moſes* as employed of God, with his Church, with which he was in the Wilderneſſe, *Acts* 7. 38. and upon his writings as a *depoſitum*, left with the Church, they are of equal concernment, to us, as they were to the Jews, if we be as the Church of the Jewes was, a Church of God. This to me is plaine, not only by thoſe Texts of *Moſes* quoted in New Teſtament-Scriptures, as we heard before, but quoted alſo as from *Moſes*: The Apoſtle pleading for Miniſters maintenance, ſaith, *For it is written in the Law of* Moſes, 1 *Cor* 9.9. How were this argument of force, if *Moſes* his writings were not of uſe? That of *Peter* is convincing, 1 Pet. 1. 15,16. *But as he which hath called you is holy, ſo be ye holy in all manner of converſation; becauſe it is written, be ye holy for I*

13.

am

am holy; This was written by *Moſes*, Lev. 11. 44. Lev. 19. 2. Lev. 20. 7. and why ſhould we be engaged to holineſſe, *eo nomine*, becauſe *Moſes* writ it, and gave it in charge, in caſe *Moſes* his writings do not binde Chriſtians? This alſo to me is plaine, in reaſon, Chriſt was King then, as now, his Church is the ſame, now, as then, we, and they make up one Kingdome, *Matth.* 8.11. The Lawes of Chriſt therefore (unleſſe they appear to be repealed) are now, in force as in former times. There is not a temporal Obligation (ſaith Maſter *Burges Vindiciæ Legis*, page 162.) laid upon a perpetual duty. The duties are confeſſed, to be perpetual, why ſhould *Moſes* then deliver them to be only of temporal permanency? Neither is there any thing brought by *Soto*, or any other hand to evince the contrary. In the cloſe of the words already quoted, he ſayes, *Moſe could not binde us, but Chriſt, for we are not Jews, but Chriſtians*, To this we ſay, He could not binde us, authoritatively, but miniſterially, and becauſe *Chriſt* bindes, therefore *Moſes* bindes; ſeeing, *Moſes* was a ſervant, in that houſe, where Chriſt was a Sonne, Chriſt was King of his Church, in *Moſes* his dayes, *Iſrael* tempted Chriſt in diſobeying *Moſes*, 1 *Cor.* 10.9. He commanded for Chriſt, when he gave command to the *Iſraelites*, and theſe commands are of concernment unto Chriſtians, who are their fellow ſubjects. The Arguments produced by *Soto* are ſatisfyingly anſwered by *Bellarmine*. *Soto* ſaith, that the Preface of the law leads to the *Iſraelites* onely, *I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the houſe of bondage.* But it was the Jews, and not Chriſtians, that were in *Egypt*. This is falſe, as one of theſe Jeſuites truly anſwers the other, we were in *Egypt* as well as the Nation of the Jews; They were our fathers, and we their children, 1 *Cor.* 10.1. It was once indeed otherwiſe with us, being branches of the wilde Olive; But the natural branches, being cut off, we are grafted into their ſtead, that mercy of deliverance from *Egypt*, being a Church-mercy, is our mercy. He further objects that of *Luke* 16. 16. *The Law and the Prophets were until* John, and is anſwered, that, that is underſtood of the Law, prophecying by figures, and not inſtructing in manners, which is further explained, *Matth.* 11.13. *For all the Prophets and the Law prophecyed until John*, that is, all the propheſies of the Meſſiah to come, whether delivered in words by the Prophets, or by ſignes and Law-cere-

monies did not reach beyond *John*, who was the last of the Prophets, who did bear witnesse of Christ. Some say, that in case the Law bind, as it was delivered by *Moses*; then all that *Moses* did deliver, is obligatory to Christians, *Quâ tale*, is, *omne*, and so the ceremonial Law, bindes, as doth the Moral, and we shall bring our necks under that yoke. To this I answer, all that *Moses* did deliver doth binde, unlesse we have a release, or discharge from the same authority, by which he spake, and hence an argument is drawn, for proof of that which we have in hand, If the ceremonial Law had bound Christians to this day, had it not been revoked, and abolished, then the moral Law, which is no where revoked, or abolished (as hath been shewn) doth still bind Christians. This is plaine, there is no reason, that the ceremonial Law should be obligatory, above the Moral; But the ceremonial Law had bound Christians to this day, had it not been revoked and abolished; This is as plain, when the great question was, in the primitive times, whether the ceremonial Law did binde Christians, whether they were to circumcise their children, after the manner of *Moses*; and consequently to observe other Rites. This is decided, in making it appear, that these were abolished, as being shadows of good things to come, and an end put to their obligation. It may be further objected, that if all be of force, that *Moses* wrote, as from him, then that of divorce of the wife, on any cause is of force likewise. That was commanded by *Moses*, as the Pharisees, *Mat.* 19.7. tell the Lord Christ from *Deut.* 24.1. To this *Chemnitius* hath answered, that *Moses* delivered this, *Tanquam legislator*, as one, that gave orders to that people, as, to their political estate; not, *Tanquam Theologus*, as a Prophet, raised up to deliver the minde and will of God unto them. *Moses* his writings therefore are in force, not onely *ratione materiæ*, as *containing such precepts upon which Christ in the New Testament hath put a divine sanction*; but by vertue of a sanction from heaven put upon them, as delivered by him, and the obligation still remaining. If *Moses* once be neglected, I shall fear, that *Peter* and *Paul* will not long be honoured, *Moses* being a servant in the same house, with them, and the rest of the Apostles, and pen-men of New Testament-Scriptures.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

God entring a Covenant of Grace with his people, keeps up his Sovereignty in exerciſe of diſcipline, in the correction and chaſtiſement of his people for ſinne.

AS God holds up his Sovereignty, under the covenant of grace; in keeping on foot his commandments; ſo, alſo in his exerciſe of diſcipline, upon thoſe, with whom he is in covenant. He neither ſuffers them to be without Law, nor to go on in tranſgreſſion of his Law, with impunity and freedome. As they have his precept, to keep from ſinne, ſo they are in danger, of his hand, in caſe of ſinne; Thoſe that are againſt us in the former, are our adverſaries in this likewiſe. As they plead a manumiſſion, of Chriſtians from the mandatory power of the Law, ſo, they will alſo have them exempted from all chaſtiſement or correction. Againſt theſe we maintaine that the people of God in covenant, even thoſe, whoſe hearts are ſtedfaſt, in covenant; do ſuffer under the covenant of grace, in caſe of ſinne, and that for ſinne; For proofe of this, I ſhall bring Scripture of three ſorts.

1. Giving inſtances, of the Church and people of God, under ſore and great afflictions for ſinne, and theſe places are even without number, *Eſay* 42. 24. *Lam.* 1. 8. 3. 39. 5. 16. *Micah* 1. 5. Yea, they lie under ſufferings, till they acknowledge ſin, till their ſtomacks are brought down, and they humble themſelves for ſin, *Lev.* 26. 41. Againſt this, is objected, that among theſe afflicted ones, there were reprobates, as well as elected ones; and Elect ones in the ſtate of unconverſion, and they might ſuffer for ſinne, which the childe of God does not, nor can not; To this I anſwer; 1. There were true converts among theſe, or elſe the whole world had no converts in it. 2. Theſe, in their confeſſions, and humiliations, involved themſelves among the reſt; and make themſelves, of the number of thoſe, that by ſinne draw down ſufferings, as we have *Ezra*, *Daniel*, and others for examples.

2. Instances of the most precious Saints sinning and suffering for sinne; 1. *Moses* and *Aaron*, Numb. 20. 12. *The Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, because, ye beleeved me not, to sanctifie me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this Congregation into the land which I have given them*; Both their sinne and their sufferings, are noted there, which *Moses* seems never to have done with, *Deut.* 1. 37. *Deut.* 3 26. *Deut.* 4. 21. *Deut.* 34. 4. 2. *David*, his sinne we finde, 1 *Sam.* 11. at large related, his sufferings, in the next chapter, he suffers in all his relations, 1. As, a father, his childe dies. 2. As, an husband, his bed is defiled. 3. As, a Prince, the sword is brought upon his land. 3. *Solomon*, 1 Kings 11. 11. *For as much, as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my Covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the Kingdom from thee, and I will give it to thy servant.* 4. *Hezekiah*, 2 Chron. 32 25. 26. *But* Hezekiah *rendred not again according to the benefit done unto him, for his heart was lifted up, therefore there was wrath upon him, and upon Judah and Jerusalem. Notwithstanding, Hezekiah humbled himself, for the pride of his heart, both, he, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that the wrath of the Lord, came not upon them, in the dayes of Hezekiah.* In which words we see, his sinne, his suffering for sinne, and his humiliation upon account of his sinne. Here also exception is taken; These here mentioned say some, lived under Old Testament dispentations; To this I answer. 1. We may take up *Pauls* words in behalf of these, 2 *Cor.* 10. 7. *If any man trust to himself, that he is Christs, let him of himself, think this again, that, as he is Christs, so they were Christs. Moses*, that suffered (as we have heard) upon the account of sinne, *esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches, then the treasures of Egypt*, Heb. 11. 26. And *David* that suffered in like sort, in spirit called him Lord, *Matth.* 22. 43. 2. That we may not lose Old Testament-Scriptures, for if we lose them here, we shall hold them no where, let us look upon *Prov.* 3. 11, 12. *My sonne, despise not the chastening of the Lord; neither be weary of his correction, for, whom the Lord loveth, he correcteth, even as the father the sonne, in whom he delighteth.* In which words we see, 1. The sufferings of the people of God thrice repeated. 2. The impulsive cause, implyed in the word [chastisement] which ever is for some fault, *Psalme* 39. 11. 3. The hand that inflicts

[the

[the Lord] 4. His way of dealing as a [Father] in love and not in vengeance. Now turne to *Heb.* 12.5,6,7. and there we shall see the Apostle. 1. Quoting this Scripture. 2. Checking them for not heeding it. 3. Commenting upon it; *Ye have forgotten the exhortation, which speaketh unto you, as unto children, My sonne despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him; For whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth; If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you, as with sonnes, for what sonne is he whom the Father chasteneth not?* These words of the Apostle, confirm all the Old Testament proofs before mentioned, give a shrewd check, to all those that would cast them off, and are a full New Testament-proof of the point in hand, our aversaries tell us, that the children of God, in New Testament-times, have that great and happy priviledge, to be free from all chastisements for sinne, The Apostle, on the other hand sayes, that, it is their happinesse to be chastised, and would be their sorrow, if they were without chastisement. *For this cause* (saith the Apostle) *many are weak, and sickly among you, and many sleep*, 1 Cor. 11.30. There, we see, judgements inflicted, the persons suffering, and the cause of suffering assigned. The judgements are set out. 1. By the quality or kinde, such as were visible on the outward man; as, their sinne was open, so was their suffering. 2. By their severall degrees, in which they suffered; some weak, languishing, under infirmities; some sick, taken with diseases; some fallen asleep, surprised with death. The persons suffering are set out. 1. By their multitude [*many*]. 2. By the application of the stroke, *Corinthians* had sinned, and *Corinthians* suffered. The cause is implyed in the illative particle [For] and expresst in the foregoing words, their unworthy addresses unto the Lords Table, sinfully eating and drinking, they eat and drink their own judgement, and though it cannot be said, that all were in grace, that thus suffered, yet there were some at least in grace among them, in that the Lord chastened them in the world, that they might not be condemned with the world. The Lord Christ speaks fully to this in his letter from heaven to *Laodicea* the Church of, Rev. 3. 19. *As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten.*

As Scripture, expresly holds out this truth, so, it is also clear in reason, if God should not hold up his Sovereignty, in this way

of

of exercise of discipline; upon his children, his love could not be continued to them, but would be withdrawn from them, as we see in Christs words but now mentioned, *Rev.* 3.19. as, also in those words of *Solomon* and the Apostle, *Pro.* 3.11. *Heb.* 12. 5, 6, 7. The love of God is such to his children, and such a league of friendship is past between them (say our adversaries) that it will not suffer him to strike them. We say, his love is such, that he cannot forbear to strike, and will not suffer that they should sinne, and carry it with impunity. There are indeed some such parents, that are so indulgent, that, children must neither have, check, nor stroke from them, what course soever they take, they scarce hear words, much lesse do they suffer stripes. These, call this love, but a wiser then they, calls it by the name of hatred, *Prov.* 13 24. *He that spareth the rod, hateth his sonne, but he that loveth him, chasteneth him betimes.* Pity, will not suffer, to make children smart; But it is greater pity, that the want of smart, should bring them to the condemnation of hell, *Prov.* 23.13,14. *With-hold not correction from the childe, for, if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die; Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell.* A childe in sinne, must either be beaten, or spared; Beating will not be his death, but sparing tends to his condemnation. The similitude is not ours, but the Holy Ghosts. One of the most terrible texts in all the Bible may be found (as one sayes) *Hoses* 4. 14. *I will not punish your daughters, when they commit whoredome, nor your spouses when they commit adultery*, He spares not some, that he may for ever spare them, chastening them in the world, that he may not condemn them with the world; He spares some, and everlastingly destroys them.

2. Otherwise, God would be reconciled to the sinne of his people, and in league, not only with their persons, but with their wickednesse, which is most abhorrent to his holinesse. We read of Gods reconciliation to the world, but never to the wickednesse of the world; God may be at peace with those that have sinned, not imputing their trespasses, but he will never be at peace with sin.

3. It will not stand with his honour to suffer his to go on in impunity in these ways. Their wickednesse will be said to be by his allowance. Men in sin, are ready to say (as the *Psalmist* observes)

ſerves) that *God is ſuch a one as themſelves*, Pſalme 50. 21. and that becauſe they ſinne, and he keeps ſilence. And men of the world will ſay the ſame, if his people go on in ſinne, and proſper. This, the Lord ſees and takes care, this way to prevent, *Ezek.* 39.23. *And the heathen ſhall know that the houſe of Iſrael went into captivity for their iniquity, becauſe they treſpaſſed againſt me, therefore hid I my face from them.* He will make it appear, that he is no patron to them in that which is evil.

4. God hath given in charge, to Magiſtrates, his vice-gerents for to puniſh. They are *revengers to execute wrath upon them that do evil*, Rom. 13.4. they are *ſent of God for the puniſhment of evil doers*, 1 Pet. 2.14. They have no commiſſion to ſpare, upon ſuppoſal of any intereſt, in God or grace, when they are found in any acts that are wicked. What they do, God does, they acting by his command, and by vertue of his commiſſion.

For further clearing of this point, and, if it may be, to work a right underſtanding, I ſhall lay down ſeverall Poſitions.

1. God conſidered in his abſolute Sovereignty, may inflict ſufferings, without injuſtice on his innocent creatures, there is no abſolute neceſſity, that ſinne ſhould go before all manner of trouble; Puniſhment cannot be without a fault; that, alwayes implies guilt, where juſtice is followed. Yet, ſuch is Gods Sovereignty, that he may lay affliction where there is no tranſgreſſion. We do it upon our fellow-creatures, we tread upon wormes that never did offend us; God may much more do it upon his creatures, yea, God does it. How much do bruit creatures ſuffer in the world, and unwillingly ſuffer? as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Rom.* 8. 20. and that from Gods hand, that hath made them ſubject to theſe ſufferings; that, which God doth unto one creature, he may do unto any creature; that which he doth to the meaneſt, he may do to the moſt noble creature. As a potter may make veſſels, ſome to honour, and ſome to diſhonour; ſo God having more tranſcendent Sovereignty, may make ſome creatures, ever bleſſed; and others during pleaſure, to remaine in miſery.

2. It ſtands not yet with Gods ordinate juſtice, to ſtrike his people, where there is no fault. The termes of the covenant

being pre-suppoſed; none can ſuffer that have not offended. every one, upon engagement from God, muſt be happy, that is innocent. This is plainly implyed in thoſe words, *In the day that thou eateſt, thou ſhalt ſurely die*, ſinne not, and ſuffer not, and more explicitely held out in thoſe words, *do this, and live*, under death is comprized all evil, from which man upon covenant is free, that doth not ſinne: Under life is compriſed, all bliſſe, which, upon covenant, all are to enjoy that yeeld full obedience; So; that the inlet of ſuffering, is from ſinne, *Rom.* 5. 12. God having, (as I may ſay) tyed himſelf, not out of Sovereignty, to afflict, when man hath not offended.

3. When way is made by ſinne, to divine juſtice, to bring evil upon man, yet the reaſon why, this, or that evil, is inflicted, on this or that man; is not alwayes mans provocation by ſinne; All afflictions are not puniſhments; nor yet corrections, or chaſtiſements. There are often other ends and motives. Sometimes, God looks ſolely at himſelfe, alone at his own glory, in his ſtrokes; of this we have many inſtances, *John* 9. 1,2. *John* 11. 4. The ſame we may ſay of the viper upon *Pauls* hand, *Acts* 28. 4,5. Sometimes he looks at his people in the ſufferings that he inflicts.

1. The patients themſelves, laying afflictions upon them, not as corrections reſpecting by-paſt faults, but tryals for diſcovery of their graces. That which God laid upon *Job*, was not for his ſinne, but to make it appeare, that Satan had formed a falſe charge againſt him, that his whole ſervice of God, was upon by-ends, and baſe accounts, and that ſufferings (God appearing againſt him in contrary providences) would preſently draw him into all wickedneſſes. It was a ſore affliction to *Abraham*, to leave his countrey, and his fathers houſe, to offer up his ſonne *Iſaac*, yet theſe were no corrections, or chaſtiſements, that we know, but temptations.

2. He looks upon others, that are no ſufferers, to bring about mercy to one, by the ſufferings of another; ſo it was in *Joſephs* ſufferings, *Gen.* 50. 20.

4. The corrections that God lays upon the godly, are far different from thoſe that he layes upon the wicked. His hand upon his own children, differs much from his hand upon his enemies. God deales otherwiſe with a Nation, that is a ſtranger to him, then

then he deals with a people that are his own, *Jerem.* 30. 11. *Though I make a full end of all Nations whither I have scattered thee; yet will I not make a full end of thee, but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished.* Though both suffer, yet they do not equally, and alike suffer. So, it is with the Elect, and reprobate, both suffer from the hand of God; but there is great difference in their sufferings. 1. They differ in the cause from whence their sufferings respectively do arise: The sufferings of the wicked, are out of pure wrath, wicked men, being under a state of wrath. The sufferings of the people of God, are out of present displeasure, but yet out of love, *Prov.* 13. 11. Heb. 12. 6, 7. 2. They differ in the end of their sufferings. A piece of silver is trode upon, with the feet to scoure and brighten it, but a worme or spider, to crush or spoile it. 3. They differ in the respective improvement, that either make of them, the godly are are bettered by their afflictions, their sufferings are their purges, and purifications, *Psalme* 119. 67. Their eares are thereby opened for discipline, *Job* 36. 10. the wicked are more and more hardened by them, and grow more and more wicked under them, *Esay* 1. 5. 2 *Chron.* 28. 22. The Sunne hardens the earth, but softens the butter and the wax.

The sufferings of the people of God many times proceed from as high displeasure in God, as can stand with love, and the more high the sinne is, the greater and sorer is his displeasure: They work in God as great a dislike as can stand with his purpose, not utterly to leave and cast them off. When *David* had sinned, in that high manner as he did, the Text saith, *The thing that David did displeased the Lord*, 2 Sam. 11. *ult.* Few men have had more of Gods heart then he, yet we see, his heart rises in sore displeasure, against his wickednesse. We may see how he takes him up for it, we can scarce see, in all the Scriptures, a man so chidden. The Prophet reckons up the courtesies and high favours that he had received from God, *I anointed thee King over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul, and I gave thee thy Masters house. and thy Masters wives into thy bosome, and gave thee the house of Israel, and of Judah, and if that had been too little, I would more-over have given thee such and such things.* And as he had before aggravated his wickednesse, in a parable;

ſo in expreſſe termes, he further layes it open. *Wherefore haſt thou deſpiſed the Commandment of the Lord; in doing evil in his ſight, thou haſt killed Uriah the Hittite with the ſword, and haſt taken his wife to be thy wife.* Then he falls to threatnings, three great evils (as we may there ſee) follow upon this evil; yet, all this while that the Lord thus chides him, that he thus threatens and beats him, he doth not ceaſe to love him, as appears in *Nathans* words, *verſe* 13. *The Lord hath put away thy ſinne*; ſome will have love and anger to be inconſiſtent, hatred and wrath inſeparable; God is angry, as they ſay, with none, but thoſe that he hates, and when anger appears, love is no more; But all know that this is falſe among men, a father is many times angry with his child, that he would be loath to hate; It is as falſe with God, he was wrath with *Moſes*, but he never hated *Moſes*, he owns his with much love, when he manifeſts much diſlike and diſtaſte of their preſent actions.

6. Theſe ſufferings of the godly muſt by no means be acccunted ſatisfactions of divine juſtice, as coming from vindicative wrath, nor any part of the curſe, that is due from vindicative juſtice for ſin. Having a tendency not to harme, but to reforme; not to deſtroy, but amend; they are only fatherly corrections, and chaſtiſements, not properly (at leaſt as ſome rigidly underſtand the word) puniſhments; ſatisfaction was the work of Chriſt, and the whole of the curſe was divolved upon him, *Gal.* 3. 13. Pápiſts do diſtinguiſh between the friendſhip that is loſt by ſinne, and the juſtice that is deſerved. The friendſhip that is loſt, is made up again, as they confeſſe, of free grace; but the juſtice deſerved, muſt by the offender be ſatisfied, which how impoſſible it is, for man to do, and how injurious to the ſufferings of Chriſt, to attempt the doing of it, let us gueſſe by the definition that *Bellarmine* gives of it, *Lib. quart. de peniten. cap.* 1. *Actio, quâ is, qui alterum læſit, tantum facit, quantum ſatis eſt, ad injuriam compenſandam, ſive, is qui læſus eſt, juſtè exigit.* All that we can ſuffer, can never ſatisfie, the wrong that our ſinnes have done to the divine Majeſty, God may juſtly exact more, then either on earth, or in their imaginary purgatory; any man can diſcharge. As the ſufferings of this life, are not worthy of the glory that ſhall be revealed; ſo, neither do they match the evil that juſtly might be inflicted. They are all juſt, but not from Gods reveng-

ing

ing juſtice. In themſelves they have the nature of curſes, but they are no part of the curſe, which upon the breach of the covenant of works, and upon the tranſgreſſion of the Law, is menaced. As a skilful Phyſician, makes poiſon up into a medicine, ſo doth God turne curſes into bleſſings; they ſerve not to kill, but to cure his people.

7. Theſe ſufferings, are not yet barely as ſome uſe to ſpeak from ſinne, but chaſtiſements for ſinne, not only to prevent ſin, that it may not be committed; but becauſe men have allready ſinned. The *Corinthians* were chaſtened, not alone, leaſt they ſhould prophane the Lords Supper; but becauſe they had prophaned it. God afflicted *David*, not onely leſt he ſhould commit adultery, but becauſe he had committed adultery: He threatens *Eli*, and puniſheth him, not only, leſt he ſhould be too indulgent to his ſons; but becauſe he had been too indulgent to them. It cannot be conceived, how afflictions ſhould prevent ſin to come, if they do not correct ſin already paſt, why are men afraid to ſinne upon account of ſufferings, but becauſe upon ſin they have ſuffered? Smart for ſinne, makes a childe of God watchful againſt ſin. The childe, that hath ſeen his fathers frowne is afraid leſt he ſhould frowne againe; that hath beene ſcourged, knows what a father thinks of a fault, and is afraid of a ſecond.

It is here objected, that it ſtands not with juſtice, in this way, to afflict beleevers, ſeeing Chriſt in their ſtead hath made ſatisfaction; and to puniſh one ſinne twice, is injurious. *Anſw.* 1. Theſe know, that *Socinians* deny, that Chriſt hath made any ſatisfaction, and if theſe two cannot ſtand together, *viz.* Chriſts ſatisfaction, and beleevers correction, they will ſoone aſſume that beleevers do ſuffer, (for which the Scripture is very full) and therefore Chriſt hath not ſatisfied, and ſo their dangerous errour will be ſupported. 2. One truth muſt not be produced to the overthrow of another, Chriſt ſatisfaction, takes us out of the hand of condemnation, and delivers from revengeful wrath, but not out of the hand of diſcipline; when God becomes a Saviour, he doth not ceaſe to be a Sovereign; a father, that is a Judge, may laſh his childe, that he never intends to ſentence. If any will ſee further Objections raiſed and anſwered, let him conſult Mr. *Burges* of juſtification. *Part.* 1. *Lecture* 5. *pag.* 33.

CHAP. XIV.

Agreement between the Covenant of works and the Covenant of grace.

HAving asserted a covenant of grace, and premised such things that may contribute some light, towards a right understanding of it, I must proceed to enquire into the respective agreement, and differences between these covenants. The former is an easie work, there being no controversie or dispute raised about it, and therefore I shall briefly passe it over. They agree, 1. In the general nature of a covenant, both are covenants strictly so called, as hath already been demonstrated. 2. They have one and the same authour, that is God. He proposed the termes of the covenant, to *Adam*, for himself, and all of his posterity, and he enters covenant with the posterity of *Adam*, in their fallen condition. 3. The parties in covenant, are in both of them, God and man, God propounding, man accepting, though there be (as we have heard) that would have it otherwise. 4. In either of both, there is a tendency to mans happinesse, Life is given in promise in both, as we see *Rom.* 10 5, 6, &c. where both covenants are distinctly considered, what difference or agreement there may be in the life promised, will after be spoke unto. 5. In both of them there is a restipulation from man as there is an engagement from God; as, God engageth himself for reward, so man is engaged to duty; the former was never doubted, the later hath been largely proved. 6. In either of both, righteousnes is called for from those that enter covenant. For the first it is not questioned, in that it is a covenant of Works. Failing in doing was death. Interest in perfect righteousnesse is required in the latter, which is called, the righteousnesse of faith, and is the righteousnesse of the Law, performed, not by our selves, but by another, *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnesse to every one that beleeveth*, Rom. 10. 4. Sincerity, in inherent righteousnesse is required likewise, both of these will be more fully demonstrated. 7. Either of both are indispensable, the conditions being not per-

performed, the penalty of the covenant in both is inflicted, *Adams* posterity had experience of the one, and all unbeleevers, and impenitent ones, will bear the other; not believing, not repenting brings death, as sometimes not perfectly obeying. That distinction, of the covenant of grace, calling for one thing, and accepting of another, afterwards will be considered. 8. Neither of both covenants are personal, as entered with any single person, or persons, and determined in him or them, but both of them, include posterity. In the covenant of works, it is not so expressly delivered, but not to be doubted. That covenant was entred with *Adam*, for all his, the latter is more expresse, to the covenanters and their seed, both in Old and New Testament-Scriptures, which by a party is questioned, but remaines largely to be confirmed.

CHAP. XV.

Differences between the Covenants of Works and the Covenant of Grace.

HAving spoken to the agreement between these two Covenants, I must now more largely enquire into the differences, which will prove a work of greater difficulty, there being so much opposition. The first and leading difference is, that being both of them between God and man, they were entred into in a different estate and condition of man. The first was entered *in statu instituto*, in mans integrity, when man had not at all, by sinne incurred the displeasure of God, or weakened his abilities for obedience; Man then stood as he came out of Gods hand, bearing in himselfe a lively resemblance of God. The second was *in statu destituto*, in mans fallen estate, now in sinne, under wrath, dead in sinne, and wholly disabled from yeelding obedience, of this there is no controversie, and therefore I need not make more words about it. And from hence all other differences which I shall observe; or which (as I suppose) are observable, have their rise; which are these following.

The Covenant of Works was entred into in mans state of integrity.

The Covenant of Grace was entered into in mans fallen condition.

The

The Covenant of Works was to mans preservation.

The covenant of Works, or (as learned *Camero* calls it) the covenant of Nature, was for preservation of man in life, that is, in present blisse and happinesse, to hold him in the condition in which it found him, which is implyed in the penalty threatned, as was before noted; man must not die till sinne enter, and expresst in that promise of God, *Do this and live*; His life must be continued as long as his obedience lasted, his happinesse must have been perpetuated, (though not necessarily in the same degree, God might have translated him from a life on earth to a life in heaven) had he kept to the terms of the covenant The covenant of grace is for mans restitution, reconciliation and recovery; He was before in blisse, and if he had so abode, he might with good reason have taken up *Peters* words, *It is good for us to be here.* Now he is in misery, and must be restored, if ever he be blessed, and so a farther difference doth arise.

The Covenant of Grace was to mans restitution.

The Covenant of Works was first in time.

The Covenant of Grace in order of time followed after.

The covenant of works had its precedency, was first in time; The covenant of grace in order of time follows after; This must needs follow, Mans estate in integrity being before his fall, the covenant made in his integrity, must needs precede the covenant entred into in his fallen condition, unlesse we will place the third of *Genesis* before the first, the fall of man before his creation; And therefore that is utterly a mistake in one, who in the very entrance upon his Treatise of the two covenants, gives the covenant of grace the precedency in time, giving this as his reason, why he places the covenant of Grace before the covenant of Works, *because the covenant of Grace was in being before the covenant of Works*, quoting for proof, *Gal.* 3. 17. *The covenant which was made before of God in Christ, the Law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disanul.* But this can by no means serve his purpose, unlesse we should conclude that the covenant of Works had its beginning in Mount *Sinai* at the giving of the Law by *Moses*, and the covenant of Grace, of only four hundred and thirty yeares more ancient standing. And that, will as little serve his purpose which he after brings in, that there was an *agreement and covenant between God the Father, and his Sonne Jesus Christ about the salvation of man before* Adam *sinned, yea, before the world began*; Seeing that covenant between the first and second person of the Trinity, was not the covenant, which he hath in hand to treat upon, namely the *covenant which God entred with man,*

man, as he himself confesses; No covenant can be made with man before man be in being, *A non ens* can be no party in a covenant. And whereas we are told that *the same covenant which was made with Jesus Christ before time, was afterwards made with man.* I desire that all would observe what is laid down in that Treatise concerning that covenant. *Christ for his part was by covenant to become a Mediatour, Surety, and Saviour; for all those that his Father should give him.* And must we become such Mediatours Sureties and Saviours also? God the Father did promise to Christ, as is further said, *all the things that did belong to his Mediatourship, and things to gratifie and satisfie him for his Mediatourship.* May we by covenant expect such things from the Father likewise? If we are neither tied to the same work, to which Christ by covenant was tied, nor are to receive the like gifts, as he by covenant was to expect, we are not in the same covenant that past between the Father and Christ. And though these two were one, which must not be yeelded, (the covenants *ad intra*, which the persons of the Trinity make with themselves, and those *ad extra* with the creature may not be confounded) yet that would evince no such precedence in time, seeing there was alike agreement in the whole Trinity for the creation of man, and Gods covenant with him in his integrity, as is fully assented to in the same Treatise, to the utter overthrow of all that which upon the former supposition he had built. To that question, *To what end should the covenant of Grace be made before man stood in need of Grace?* he answers, *Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world*; And he had all things then as present and real before the eyes of his glory, as now he hath, *viz.* Mans Creation, Fall, Recovery, and in this sense there was no precedency of time in regard of any of Gods Counsels or secret actions. And then there can be no precedency of one of his covenants before another, we must finde then a sense according to which there is a precedency, which is not found in any covenants of the Trinity among themselves (which in exact propriety of speech are purposes rather then covenants, and were before all time) but in the actual entrance and assent by the creature given, which is in time, and admits precedency; In which consideration the covenant of works hath its precedency before that of

Grace, as the ſtate of integrity was before the fall.

The Covenant of Works was a ſmall time in force.

Whence farther yet follows that the covenant of works, was but a ſmall time in force, at leaſt but a ſmall time of uſe, only during the ſpace of mans integrity, which ſome ſay was only one day, in all probability not long, in that man enjoyed no fruit of that bleſſing in Paradiſe, *Increaſe and multiply.*

The Covenant of Grace is of everlaſting continuance.

But this ſecond, is, of everlaſting continuance, when the firſt Covenant was violated by our firſt parents, and ſo made uſeleſſe, that of grace ſucceeded, which is our only planck after ſhipwrack, but none ſhall ever ſucceed this ſecond. *Adam* failing of ſalvation by the covenant of Works (which he entred in the firſt place) is ſaved by the covenant of grace, into which after his fall he entred, and into which he was of grace admitted; but he that is not ſaved by the ſecond, muſt everlaſtingly periſh, and ſo I underſtand that text, *Heb.*10. 26. *If we ſinne wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, then there remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſinnes, but a fearful looking for of judgement and fiery indignation*; where, by ſinning wilfully, I underſtand an utter rejection of Gods tender of this ſacrifice of Chriſts blood, which I gather from the Apoſtle in the words that follow, the proof that he brings of that ſad aſſertion, *He that deſpiſed Moſes Law, died without mercy under two or three witneſſes, of how much ſorer puniſhment ſhall he be thought worthy that hath trodden under foot the blood of the Sonne of God, and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was ſanctified, an unholy thing?* This is that wilful ſinne of which there is no expiation. When man had caſt off the yoke, a ſacrifice was found, Chriſt made his ſoul an offering for ſinne; but when Chriſt is rejected, there is no other ſacrifice to be looked for. In the covenant of grace God hath made known his whole minde concerning mans ſalvation, by what means, and upon what termes man ſhall be ſaved.

CHAP. XVI.

A further difference between the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace.

The Covenant of Works had no Mediatour.

ANother difference of great importance between these covenants, and which necessarily (as the two former) flows from the first, is, That the first covenant between God and man was immediate, no Mediatour intervening, no dayes-man standing between them, to make them one; But for the second, man being fallen by sinne, a Mediatour was necessary that God and man now in that distance, should be reconciled. I know some have contended, that not only man in integrity, but the Angels themselves, stood in need of Christs mediation, producing their grounds for their assertion, and then this difference between these covenants, falls, neither of both are immediate, both standing in need of a Mediatour. The grounds are,

Obj.

First, *That the obedience of man and Angels was imperfect, and stood in need of pardon, and for the righteousnesse of Christ which he performed to the Father, was accounted perfect*, quoting that place of *Eliphaz* in his speech to *Job*, *Job* 4. 18. *Even his Angels he charged with folly.* If Angels stood thus in Gods eye, under such a charge, then much more man, as *Eliphas* there argues. But I would demand of these, concerning this supposed imperfection in man and Angels, thus supplied by Christs perfection, whether it were properly, and of its own nature a sinne? If not, then there is no place for pardon; If it were, then it must be divolved on Christ, and laid upon him to expiate, and so man fell, (or at least lay down groveling) before his fall; and the good Angels by reason of sin, are evil as well as those that are fallen; but these are absurd. In that of *Eliphaz* therefore (if it must be understood of Angels of glory) sin, is not charged or implied, but only defect, standing in comparison or competition with God, an imperfection negative is yeelded, they match not God in perfection, but in his presence cover their faces with their wings, *Isa.* 6. 2. but no imperfection privative, they want no perfection of which they are in any capacity, and whereof they have any necessity;

Sol.

Cujus enim participatione justi sunt, ejus comparatione nec justi sunt. Aug. ad Orosium contra Priscil. cap. 10

God made no creature in such a necessity of sinning, or in such a being that needed pardon.

Obj. A second ground is, *That though a Mediator was not necessary by way of reconciliation, yet he was necessary by way of preservation in righteousnesse.*

Sol. The second fully overthrows the first, in that which it grants, and I know not how that can be proved that it affirms, Man was not preserved, and therefore it appears, that he had no such Mediatour appointed for his preservation. And it seems (according to this opinion) man could not have stood, unlesse Christ had been incarnate, and so his fall was not, from the freedome of his will, but the principles of his creation, For the Angels, how they can be said, to stand by grace received from Christ, as Mediatour; I know not, they being no fellow-members with us, though fellow-servants; And howsoever accidental benefits come to the Angels, by Christ, in their joy to see lost man restored, and reconciled; as to God, so also to their fellowship and communion; (according to that of the Apostle, *Ephes.* 1.10. *Col.* 1.20. in their experimental knowledge also, of the wisdome of God in this great mystery, 1 *Pet.* 1.12. *Ephes.* 3.10.) yet, I doubt not that it was for man, whose nature he assumed, that Christ was incarnate, and that he is a Mediatour between God and man, 2 *Tim.* 2.5. and not between God and Angels, and that for fallen man, and not for man in his integrity; Therefore I conclude the first covenant was immediate; no Mediatour intervening, all the blessings of the first covenant flowed from the whole Trinity, as the Creation it self, without respect to Christ incarnate, there was no revelation of that high mystery to man in innocency, In which the Reader may consult *Gomarus* in *Colos.* 1.20.

The Covenant of grace is by a Mediatour.

The covenant of grace is by a Mediatour; mans fallen condition in so great a distance from God, necessarily calling for it. *Two cannot walk together unlesse they be agreed,* Amos 3.3. That fallen man may walk in covenant with God; it is necessary that a way of agreement be found, This the second person of the Trinity, by covenant with the Father hath undertaken, and therefore he is stiled *The Mediatour of the New Testament,* Heb. 9.15. *A Mediatour of a better Covenant,* Heb. 8.6. *The Mediatour of the New Covenant,* Heb. 12.24. Many obstacles were in the way of mans covenanting with God; and attaiment of the mercies and grace of the covenant, all of which lay on the Mediatour, to remove, that

that God and man might once more be at one; All of these Christ undertakes and effects, and so is the Meditatour in this work.

CHAP. XVII.

Works incumbent upon the Mediatour of the Covenant of Grace.

THis work of Christ in his Mediatourship, I suppose may fitly be reduced to these heads.

First, to bring man into a capacity of covenanting with God.

Secondly, to bring man into the bond of the covenant; professedly to accept it.

Thirdly, to enable those whom he brings to glory; to perform the duties of the covenant, to be steady and upright in it.

Fourthly, to crown those with glory; whom by grace he brings up to the terms of the covenant.

Christ brings man into a capacity of covenanting with God.

1. He is to bring man into a capacity of covenanting, of which sinne had made mankinde uncapable, for though it should be granted, that God in absolute justice, is not bound to punish sinne wheresoever he findes it; and that it is not against his Essence (as some would have it) to pardon sin without satisfaction, yet his ordinate justice is thus bound, That law of his, being presupposed, *The day that thou eatest, thou shalt surely die*, he cannot recede from it; the penalty of this Law must be born; in order to reconciliation, and justice satisfied for mans transgression, which must be done by such a one, that can answer the claime of divine justice. The beasts of the Forrests, and cattel of a thousand hills (which were yet often given to God in sacrifice) could not do it. The Apostle tells us, that *it is impossible that the blood of Bulls and Goats should take away sinne*, Heb. 10.4. They were never guilty, and they are no valuable consideration, nor yet the Angels who are above mankinde, as the bruit creatures are below. Man had sinned, and a sacrifice from among man-kinde, is to be found, Neither can man in sin, and under the taint of it be accepted, all that he can

ſuffer is due for himſelf, and therefore can be no other mans diſcharge. In the payment of my own debt, I ſet free no other debtor; Neither can any, that is meer man go thorow with it, here is pure juſtice without relaxation, as to the value, confeſt by thoſe who yet contend whether *idem* or *tantundem* be paid by Chriſt, the ſame in kinde, as was owing by man, or the like in value and eſtimate; He that is brought under a divine attachment, muſt not come out till he have paid the uttermoſt farthing, which man in torments is ever in diſcharging, and never can diſcharge; It is as eaſie to make a world, as by way of ranſome to deliver a ſoul. Chriſt *therefore that knew no ſin, is made ſinne, that is, an offering for ſinne. God manifeſt in the fleſh*, he that was God and man, hath undertaken the work, man to ſuffer, and God to ſatisfie in ſuffering, and ſo *God is in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf*, 2 *Corinth.* 5. 19. The immediate effect or reſult of this price of mans redemption, (I ſuppoſe) is the putting of man into a capacity of a covenant with God, yet when this is done, till more be done, by Chriſt in the way of his Mediatourſhip for man, men are not yet in covenant, not the Elect among men. This is evident in thoſe Epheſians, *that were raiſed up together, and made ſit together in heavenly places in Chriſt Jeſus*, Epheſ. 2. 6. There was no time in which Chriſt had not paid the price of their ranſome, yet there was a time, and then but lately over, that they were *without Chriſt, being aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the covenant of promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the world*, Epheſ. 2. 12. Elect Infidels are not till their call, in covenant, they ſtand not actually reconciled, and one with God before Faith, for then there needed no Miniſtery of reconciliation to follow. If this were granted, then Chriſt did the whole for mans ſalvation on the croſſe by himſelf, and doth nothing now in heaven, by way of interceſſion, nor any thing by his agents in a miniſterial way upon earth, neither could man before faith, be under wrath, in which he is yet concluded by our Saviour himſelf, *John* 3. 36. A ſtate of wrath, and an actual reconciled eſtate cannot ſtand together. There is a price paid, and (as I may ſay) in the Fathers hand, but to be applyed according to the good pleaſure of the Father and the Sonne; A man may purchaſe a priſoners liberty; ſo that he hath it in his juſt and legal power to ſet him free; and yet take what time he pleaſeth in diſcretion to impart it

to

to him, and actually deliver him. In this work there are three parties; God the Father, as Creditor, Christ Jesus, the Surety, Man, the Debtor. The Father might have refused this discharge from the hand of Christ, and exacted it of the principal; Christ might have refused to have made such payment, he was not in the Obligation; There was a relaxation of the person, as is agreed on all parties; Man must come in and manifest his acceptance, Till he is content to leave his old master, sin and Satan; This new Lord gives him no entertainment, he must be content to come out of bondage, or else he can enjoy no freedome.

Christ brings man within the verge of the Covenant. 1. By his tender of it.

2. The next work of Christ, is to bring man within the bond of the covenant professedly to accept it, for which there is yet a double work. First, to make tender of it, this hath been Christs work as the Prophet of his Church in all ages. In what latitude in was carried in the dayes of the fathers before the flood, it is rather obscurely pointed at; then plainly shewed; yet there was then a distinction, between the posterity of *Seth*, and that of *Cain*, and so contiued till the dayes of *Noah*, when *the sonnes of God saw the daughters of men*; children of the covenant, saw those out of the covenant; Men within the visible Church, saw women without the Pale, and joyned themselves in marriage with them. From *Abrahams* dayes it was confined to his posterity, and held within his line, and those few that as proselytes joyned themselves unto them. In Gospel-times it is enlarged, the tender is made not to Jewes only, but also to every Nation under heaven, the Commission being to preach the Gospel to every creature, none by Nation so contemptible, that is to be excluded. *In Christ Jesus there is neither Barbarian, nor Scythian, Jew or Gentile, Col.* 3. 11. And, as there is to be a tender; so also it is his work to shape the heart for acceptation of it, to embrace the terms, and enter into it. *God shall perswade* Japhet, *and he shall dwell in the tents of* Shem, *Gen.* 9. 27. The inhabitants of the Isles peopled by *Japhets* posterity shall become the *Israel* of God, shall succeed the Jewes in a Church-state, and visible profession of the name of God, *The hand of the Lord was with them*, namely, those that preacht at *Antioch, and a great number beleeved*, Acts 11.21. where beleeving (after the manner of the History in the *Acts*) is no other then embracing the Doctrine of Faith, they were

2. By shaping the heart for it.

were made Disciples, many of which after fell off, even from their profession.

Christ brings up to the terms of the Covenant.

A third work is to enable those whom he brings to glory (those among them in covenant that are called according to his purpose) to performe the duties of the covenant, to be stedfast and upright in it, and this is by *Circumcising their heart, giving them a new heart, writing his Law in their hearts, putting it into their inward parts, keeping them by his mighty power through faith unto salvation*; of which more hereafter.

Christ crowns those that come up to the terms of the covenant

The last work is to crown with glory those that by grace he raises up, to the termes of the covenant, thus qualifying them, he crowns them, *I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousnesse, which the Lord, the righteous Judge shall give me at that day*, 2Tim. 4 7,8. *I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to my self*, John 14. 2, 3.

Difficulties removed.

Here some difficulties offer themselves, If the covenant of works (past between God and man in his integrity) were immediate, and the transactions of it without reference to Christ, then it follows that faith in Christ is not commanded in that Law, which was given to man for a rule, There being no possibility of it, there could be no command for it, and there was no possibility of *Adams* beleeving it, seeing Christ was not revealed, and was not as Mediatour of any use. This opinion is strongly maintained by Arminians. *Armin. in resp. ad artic. decimum nonum. Corvinus Contr. Molin. cap.* 11. And to this end, that they may make it good, that God cannot in justice require faith in Christ, from man in his fallen condition, unlesse he withal confer upon him abilities to believe, seeing he never had that power from him in his integrity, and state of purity, and upon this supposition the argument seems of force. We vindicate Gods justice in commanding works; though to us now impossible, seeing once we had power to reach the highest of his precepts, and his command, is no rule of our empaired strength, but of our duty. But if men never had that power, and the Law never required it, it is injustice (according to all parties) to exact it. Let those that fall to the Arminians in this tenent, (that they may make the Law an imperfect rule, and an insufficient direction) see how they can a-

Obj.

Faith is a duty of the moral Law.

Answ.

avoid it, how they can vindicate Gods justice thus impeached. But the Orthodox party have still maintained that *Adam* had, in his integrity that faith that doth justifie, though then it performed not that office of justification, as he had that faculty whereby we see dead bodies; though then there was no possibility of such sight, there being no dead bodies to be seen. And that faith in Christ is commanded in the first precept of the Law is manifest. There we are commanded to have God for our God, no Interpreter will deny, that the affirmative is contained in that negative: *Thou shalt have none other gods but me.* Now God is the God of beleevers, *Heb.* 11.16. No man can have any communion with God, but by faith in Christ. And so consequently this faith is there required; what Expositor of the Law doth not put trust and affiance in God, within the affirmative part of the first commandment, as well as fear, love, and obedience? And without Christ there can be no affiance or trust. If we conceive the moral Law, to reach no farther then the duties expressely there named, or the evils forbidden, we shall make it very scant and narrow, we shall see small reason, of that of the Psalmist, *Thy Commandment is exceeding broad*, Psalme 119. 96. But in case we take in all that by necessary consequence may be inferred, according to the approved rules of interpretation, then scarce any duty is more clearly laid down then this of faith in Christ. And whereas one saith, *A man cannot preach Faith in Christ out of the Moral Law*, I say, a man out of the Moral Law, may evince the necessity of Faith in Christ; unto every one that lives in Gospel-light, to whom Christ is tendred; The Law requires the duty, and the Gospel discovers the object, no man out of the Law could have evinced *Abraham* that he must offer his sonne, nor that he must have left his countrey, but when Gods minde was made known to him, the Moral Law did binde him to obedience, and he had sinned against the Moral Law, in case he had refused. There is no command given of God to any man, at any time, of an nature whatsoever, but the Moral Law ties him to the observation of it, not immediately, explicitely, but upon supposition of such a command intervening. *Therefore ye shall observe all my Statutes, and all my judgements, and do them, I am the Lord*, Levit. 19.37. Faith in Christ being commanded of God, 1 *John* 3.23. the Moral Law obliges to o-

obedience of it. See *Molin. Anatom. Arminianiſ. cap.* 11. *Reſponſ. Wallai. ad Cenſuram Johannis Arnol. Corvini. cap.* 11. *Ball* on the covenant, *page* 105. Burges *Vindiciæ legis. page* 117.

Obj. A farther difficulty here offers it ſelfe, and an obſtruction laid againſt that which in this Treatiſe is after intended. If the covenant, or ſecond covenant (as oppoſite to that of works) be in Chriſt, and grounded on the work of reconciliation, then it is commenſurate with it, and of no greater latitude, and only the elect and choſen in Chriſt, the called according to Gods purpoſe, being reconciled, only theſe are in covenant; when the Scripture (as ſhall be, God willing, made good) confines not this covenant within the limits of the inviſible Church, known only to God. But it is as large as the Church viſible.

The Covenant of grace not commenſurate with election.

Anſw. To this I anſwer, that the Prophetical office of Chriſt, as Shepherd and Biſhop of our ſouls, and ſo much of his Kingly office as conſiſts in a legiſlative power, hath its foundation (as well as the covenant) in this work of reconciliation. Had not this been undertaken by Chriſt for mankinde, man had never enjoyed that light, man had never had an Oracle, or an Ordinance as the fruit of his Prophetick office, yet, theſe Ordinances are not commenſurate with reconciliation, nor of equal latitude with election, So neither is the covenant, but either of both in order towards it. As Ordinances therefore are Chriſts gift from heaven, as the fruit of his death and reſurrection, when yet all that partake of theſe Ordinances do not yet die or riſe with Chriſt; So, is the covenant, when yet all in covenant are not ſtedfaſt in it, nor obtaine the graces of it. Therefore I know not how to admit that which a Divine ſingularly eminent hath laid down; *That all the effects of Chriſts death are ſpiritual, diſtinguiſhing and ſaving*; Seeing gifts of Chriſt; from his Fathers right hand are fruits of his death, yet not ſpiritual, diſtinguiſhing and ſaving. That they are in ſome ſort ſpiritual, I dare grant that is, *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, (if I may ſo ſpeak) they have a tendency to a ſpiritual work. That they are diſtinguiſhing from the world, (as it is taken in oppoſition to the Church viſible) I yeeld, for I do not enlarge the fruit of Chriſts death to all man-kinde, aſſenting to Maſter *Owen* and Maſter *Stalham* in the grounds that they lay, of Gods reſpite of the execution of the whole penalty on man, with the continu-

ance

ance of outward favours not to be upon the account of Christ, but for other reasons; yet I know not how to affirme, that Ordinances which yet are fruits of his death, are all saving, spiritual and distinguishing, seeing they neither conferre salvation nor saving grace on all that partake of them, So that Christ, is a Mediatour of this covenant; and yet those enter into it that have not reconciliation by Christ Jesus; The Ephesians that *were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ*, Ephes. 2. 13. that is, brought into a visible Church-state in the fruition of Ordinances, made free of that city whose name is, *The Lord is here*, Ezek. 48. 35.

CHAP. XVIII.

Farther differences between the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace.

A Farther difference of importance, between these covenants, is, in the conditions annext unto either of them, and here the difference is brought to the height. This alone so diversifies them; that they are not barely, in circumstance and way of administration; but in substance two distinct covenants; The least difference in conditions, diversifies bargains and agreements on what part soever the difference is. Conditions of the covenant between God and man are of two sorts, either such in which God engages himselfe, or in which man is engaged; either the stipulation on Gods part, or else the restipulation on the part of man. The former unto which God is engaged, are, either rewards in case of covenant-keeping, or, punishments in case of covenant-breaking; The one the Lord promises, The other he threatens. I finde no material difference in the conditions on Gods part in these covenants. Life is promised in both, in case of covenant-keeping; and death is threatned in both, in case of covenant-breaking. Some indeed have endeavoured to finde a great difference in the life promised in the covenant of works, and the life that is promised in the covenant of grace;

Conditions in the Covenant of works and the covenant of grace on Gods part seem to be the same.

as also in the death that is threatned in the one, and the other, and thereupon move many, and indeed inextricable difficulties, *What life man should have enjoyed, in case* Adam *had not fallen? And what death man should have died, in case Christ had not been promised?* From which two, endlesely more, by way of consectary may be drawn; by those that want neither wit, nor leisure to debate them. In which the best way of satisfaction and avoidance of such puzling mazes; is to enquire what Scripture means by *Life*, which is the good in the covenant promised; and what by *Death*, which is the evil threatned? Now for the first; *Life* containes all whatsoever, that conduces to true happinesse, to make man blessed in soul and body. All good that Christ purchases, and heaven enjoys, is comprised under it, in Gospel-expressions. *I am come that they might have life, and that they may have it more abundantly*, John 10. 10. *He that hath the Son, hath life, and he that hath not the Sonne, hath not life*, 1 John 5. 12. On the contrary, under *Death* is comprised, all that is injurious to man or mankinde, that tends to his misery in soul and body. The damnation of Hell being called death, the uttermost of evils being the separation of soul and body from God, *John* 8. 51. 1 *John* 3. 14. Sinne which leads to it, and is the cause of it, is called death in like manner, *Ephes.* 2. 1. And the separation of soul from the body, being called death, sicknesses, plagues, are so called in like manner, *Exod.* 10. 17. Now happinesse being promised to man in covenant, only indefinitely under that notion of life, without limit to this or that way of happinesse, in this or that place, God is still at liberty, so that he make man happy, where, or how he pleaseth to continue happinesse to him, and is not tied up in his engagement either for earth or heaven. And therefore though learned *Camero* in his Treatise *de triplici fœdere*, Thes. 9. with others, makes this difference between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. *In the covenant of Works*, (which he calls nature) *life was promised, and a most blessed life, but an animal life in Paradise, in the covenant of Grace a life in Heaven and spiritual.* And Master *Baxter* in his *Aphoris.* of Justification, *page* 5. saith, *that this life promised was only the continuance of that state that* Adam *was then in, in Paradise, is the opinion of most Divines.* Yet with submission to better judgements I see not grounds for it; seeing Scripture no way determines

Life promised in the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace is one and the same.

mines the way and kinde of this happineſſe promiſed, and in caſe that we take liberty to ſay, that when long life is promiſed upon earth (in many texts of Scripture) that the promiſe is made good though it faile on earth, in caſe it be ſupplied in heaven, life being the marrow of the promiſe, much more then is it made good, when it is indefinitely promiſed, without limit to a man whil'ſt on earth, in caſe it be made good by his tranſlation into heaven. And indeed there are ſtrong probabilities, heaven being ſet out by the name of Paradiſe in Chriſts ſpeech to the thief on the croſſe; and in *Pauls* viſion in that rapture, 2 *Cor.* 12. if we may make ſuch a ſuppoſition of mans ſtanding, now he is fallen, that he ſhould not have continued a life of immortality on earth, but have been tranſlated into heaven. He had that bleſſing from God as other living creatures, *to be fruitfull and multiply*, Gen. 1. 28. and how the world could have contained all thoſe individuals at once; which to eternity man ſhould propagate, cannot be imagined. And to conceive, that an end in time ſhould be put to propagation; when an animal life in the uſe of the creature ſhould be continued, is ſcarce conſiſtent with reaſon. But a thouſand of theſe God can expedite when we are at a ſtand; He promiſed life, and he could have made it good, and we ſee he limited not himſelf, where, or how to conferre it. And what I have ſaid of life promiſed, the ſame I ſay of death threatned, in caſe man upon ſinne be brought into a ſtate of miſery, Juſtice is done, and the threat takes hold, where, and howſoever this miſery be ſuffered, whether it had been in ſorrows, and horrours on earth, in ſeparation of the ſoul firſt, for torments and the body to follow, or in a ſpeedy diſpatch of ſoul and body to hell. Gods way of execution after the ſinne committed, (on thoſe that are not by Chriſt ranſomed) does not argue that the penalty in the covenant neceſſitated him to it, might not he at once have poured out the whole of his vengeance on veſſels of wrath, when yet we know, that he takes time for the execution of it? A Learned Writer enquiring into this death that was here threatned, ſaith, that *the ſame damnation that followed the breach of the ſecond covenant, it could not be*; When I ſuppoſe it rather ſhould be ſaid, that in ſubſtance and kind, it can be no other; Infidels that were never under any other covenant then that of works; and covenant-breaking Chriſtians are in the

Death threatned in the Covenant of Works and in the Covenant of Grace is one and the ſame.

same condemnation, there is not two hells but one and the same, *for those that know not God, and those that obey not the Gospel of Christ,* 2 Thes. 1.8. Neither is there any *Limbus*, or distinct place for infants in original sinne, and out of the covenant of grace. Neither can I assent to that speech, *To say that* Adam *should have gone quick to hell, if Christ had not been promised, or sinne pardoned, is to contradict the Scriptures, that makes death temporal the wages of sinne.* It were I confesse to presume above Scripture, but I cannot see it a contradiction of Scripture; A burning Feaver, a Consumption, Leprosie, Pestilence, &c. are in Scripture made the wages of sinne, yet many go to hell and misse those diseases. And if it be said Scripture so makes death the wages of sin, that all must suffer it, I answer, Those Scriptures are all of them *leges post latæ*, appointed of God, as his way upon mans fall, neither absolute justice, nor yet the penalty threatned necessitating him to that way of proceeding. He takes the same way where his justice hath already satisfaction, Those that are priviledged from death as the wages of sinne, thus die; God tied not up his own hands, as States do their Judges, and ministerial officers, to one way of execution, and this his way with the unbeleeving is voluntary, and not necessitated, Upon these grounds it is, that I finde no reason to widen the differences between these promises and priviledges in either covenants.

The identity of conditions, in the covenant of Works and Grace, on Gods part we have seen; The great diversity in the conditions called for from man comes to be spoken to.

The conditions in the Covenat of works were in mans power.

And in the first place this difference offers it self. *The conditions of the covenant of Works were in mans power, being left to the freedom of his will; he had abilities in himself without seeking out for further assistance then a meer general concurrence to perform them.* This ability in man to answer whatsoever was called for at his hands from God, appears

B.

First, in the integrity of his nature; Being made like God, his principles must needs carry him to a conformity with God, and these principles were connatural to man, in his first being and beginning. Man being made of God to contemplate his glory, and to enjoy communion with himself, he made him not defective in any of those noble qualifications that serve for it, or have

have a tendency to it. Papists indeed will have this to be a supernaturall gift of grace, and above the glory of mans first creation. *Bellarmine* compares it to a *bridle given to curb that lust which riseth against reason in us.* That rebellion of lusts in man, they conceit, would have been, if man had not fallen; which, as it layes a high charge upon God; in such an aspersion of his pure work drawn after such a patterne; so, it makes way for other opinions, that the first motions without consent are no sins, and that lust in the regenerate, is not sin. But as the bottom is rotten, so, also the building that is raised upon it is ruinous. There was an happy agreement in man, as well with himself, as with his Creatour: The fall brought in a necessity of support and supply of Grace.

Quæ veluti aureo quodam fræno pars inferior parti superiori, & pars superior Deo facile subjecta contineretur. Bellar. *De. Grat. primi hominis*, cap. 5.

Secondly, this appears from the equity which must be granted to be in the command of God; which requires that the work given in charge be not above his abilities, that is charged with it. The *Arminian* argument from a command, to abilities to keep the command, from a threat to conclude a power to keep off from the thing threatned, is of force, as long as the person under command keeps himself in the same station, and strength, as when the command was given. But applying this to man in his fallen estate (who had sinned away his abilities,) the strength of it is wholly lost. The command of God retains its perfection; when we are under the power of corruption. The Law is nothing abated, though we be weakened.

3. It appears in the work it self which was charged upon man upon performance of which he was to expect happinesse. There is no more explicitely mentioned, then that negative precert: *Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; the day that thou eatest, thou shalt surely die.* This, all may yeeld might easily have been kept if the command had been heeded, or the menace observed. The Jews at their worst could observe the commands of *non-licet* meats, and this was a command of like nature, yet this was not all unto which man was tied, Being made in the image of God; he had clear light to discern good from evil, and as all yet retaine, darkly and obscurely; so he had the Law written in his heart, clearly; Adultery, Murder (though no otherwise condemned, then by that light which he had by creation) in that estate had been sin. The former positive Law was evil because for-

B. forbidden, take away the prohibition, and there had been no ſin in eating. Theſe are forbidden, becauſe evil: The Law imprinted by creation, being preſuppoſed, there needed no further Law to make them ſinful. They that never had the written Law, are condemned for theſe practices, by that Law which by nature is written in their hearts. But againſt theſe, there was in nature an

B. Antipathy; Mans pure nature had them in abhorrency. As now there needs no Law more then nature doth ſuggeſt, to forbid the eating of poyſon, feeding on duſt, or carrion: So then there needed no more Law to condemne theſe practices; ſo that obedience in that ſtate was in mans power muſt neceſſarily be yeelded.

The conditions in the Covenant of Grace are not performed without ſpecial aſſiſtance.

The conditions of the covenant of Grace are not performed, but by ſpecial grace; a power from God muſt concurre for their work in man; Man hath no abilities in himſelf to anſwer what God requires, and if he riſe not up to the terms of this covenant, till he raiſe himſelfe, he will for ever fall ſhort of it. As the covenant was vouchſafed of grace, ſo grace muſt make us meet to partake of the benefits of it.

Reaſons.

This appears. 1. In the ſtate and condition in which God findes man, when he firſt enters covenant with him; yea, after covenant entred, till a change be wrought, and abilities conferred to anſwer that which God in covenant requires. This ſtate of man the Apoſtle expreſſes, *Epheſ.*2. 1. *Dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*, alive, and in power for nothing at all, but ſinne. This was the condition of Heathens, never in covenant; and ſo of the Jews who were a people in actual covenant, and owned of God as his inheritance, as God willing ſhall be ſhewn. Their converſation was the ſame as the Apoſtle there confeſſeth; *Among whom we alſo had our converſation in times paſt, in the luſts of the fleſh, fulfilling the deſires of the fleſh and of the minde, and were by nature the children of wrath as well as others.* This in abundant other expreſſions in Scripture is diſcovered, holding forth the ſame thing, *Rom.* 5. 6. *For when we were yet without ſtrength, in due time Chriſt died for the ungodly.* That infant, *Ezek.* 16. 4, 5. had no more poſſibilities of life, then is to be found even in the ſtate of death.

*Reaſ.*2. It appears in that power which is exerciſed by God, in the change of thoſe in covenant with him, whom he fits for himſelf

ſelf for Eternity. This power in Scripture is ſet out, in ſeveral expreſſions. Firſt, *Creation*, Epheſ. 2. 10. *We are his workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works.* All ability to good is from the frame into which grace puts us; As there is a power out of man, which gives him Being, So alſo there is an anſwerable power, for his new Being; *He that is begotten of God, keepeth himſelf, and the evil one toucheth him not*, 1 John 5. 18. Secondly, *Quickning*. The dead have not power to raiſe themſelves, without a further power for their Reſurrection; Neither is it in the power of man, *Who is dead in treſpaſſes and ſinnes*, Eph. 2. 1. Thirdly, *Taking away the heart of ſtone, and giving an heart of fleſh*, Ezek. 36. 26. To change the nature of things, which is here done, is the work of an Omnipotence, which was Satans argument not denied by Chriſt; *If thou be the Son of God, command theſe ſtones to be made bread*, Mat. 4. 3. Fourthly, *Cauſing to walk in Gods ſtatutes*, Ezek. 36. 27. A work as of authority, ſo of power. Fifthly, *Plucking out of the power of Satan*, an act of the free grace and power of God, 2 *Tim.* 2. 26. Sixthly, *Drawing*, A work of power in him that draws, weakneſſe in him that is drawn. *Joh.* 6. 44. *No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath ſent me draw him.* And therefore the Spouſe prayeth, *Draw me, and we will run after thee*, Cant. 1. 4. There muſt be more power in God for converſion, than in Satan for the ſouls ruine. Grace muſt have advantage of temptation; but Satan can allure, perſwade; Our firſt parents had woful experience of his faculty this way, He hath his moral perſwaſions, If God make uſe of nothing more, they are even; yea, Satan hath the advantage, by ſo much as we are more apt for ſinne than obedience. And, as theſe metaphorical expreſſions hold it forth; So in plain termes it is expreſt in Scripture. The Apoſtle prayes for the *Epheſians*, that the *eyes of their underſtanding being enlightened, they may know what is the exceeding greatneſſe of Gods power, to thoſe that beleeve, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Chriſt, when he raiſed him from the dead*, Epheſ. 1. 19. And by way of *ſimile* makes Application, *ch.* 2. *verſe* 1. *&c. Even when we were dead in ſins, hath he quickned us together with Chriſt, and hath raiſed us up together, and made us ſit together in heavenly places in Chriſt Jeſus*, Epheſ. 2. 5. Leſt any ſhould ſay the former Metaphors are ſtretched above their line, when they are brought in to hold forth that for which they have been produced; the Apoſtle

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

ſtle here makes application, and ſhews that the like mighty power, which was exerciſed of God, in raiſing Chriſt, dead in the grave, and ſetting him up above all principalities and powers, is exerciſed in raiſing thoſe who are dead in ſin, to ſit in heavenly places with Chriſt. The Apoſtle entring a ſimilitude, *chap.* 1.19. makes not an end of it till, *chap.*2.*v.* 8. Only having named the exaltation of Chriſt upon his Reſurrection, does not leave till he have ſhewed how high he is exalted; and having named mans low ebbe in ſin; does not leave till he hath ſet out how low; which drawes out the ſimilitude to ſuch length, in which this truth is ſet forth unto us, which compariſon with the application, leaves the neceſſity of an Omnipotent concurrence in this work without exception.

Reaſ. 3. This further appears in that inability which is in man, to accept that which God of grace doth tender, unleſſe God cure the faculties by his power. He is wanting, 1. In power to underſtand, or to diſcerne the glory of that grace which is offered: *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are fooliſhneſſe unto him; neither can he know them, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned*, 1 Cor.2.14. This native blindneſſe in man; with the neceſſity of an Omnipotency for cure, is plain, not only in the Heathens, who (wanting the light of Revelation,) are, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, darkneſſe; But alſo in thoſe to whom light is brought, and the word preacht; that ſtand in actual covenant with God, as appears, *Deut.*29. 1. & 4. Compared, *The Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive*, (ſpeaking to men in covenant) *and eyes to ſee, and ears to hear, unto this day.* 2. In will to deſire, and heart to embrace any ſuch tender; but on the contrary there is a readineſſe ſtill to oppoſe, which is plain, not onely by the ſtirres that are raiſed whereſoever the word is preach't, as we ſee through the Hiſtory of the *Acts*, So that it is grown into a Proverb, *Evangelicum ciet bellum*, But alſo by the ſtrugglings to withſtand any motion or conviction which the Word works; what *Stephen* tells the Jews that they did, that each man by nature is apt to do, *to reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt.* *Acts* 7.51. There is much reſiſtance in the heart, which grace by power does not utterly take away, but overcome and ſubdue.

4ly This appears in Gods indication, and full declaration of himſelf, what his work is, & what is to be expected from his hand in the cove-

covenant-conditions which he requires of us, which we finde from his mouth in ſeveral Texts of Scripture. *The Lord thy God will circumciſe thy heart, and the heart of thy ſeed to love the Lord thy God.* Deut. 30.6. *A new heart alſo will I give you, and a new ſpirit I will put within you; I will take away the ſtony heart out of your fleſh, and I will put my Spirit within you, and cauſe you to walk in my ſtatutes,* Ezek. 36.25,26,27. But eſpecially in that Text, *Jer.* 31. 31, 32, 33, 34. *The dayes come, ſaith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the houſe of* Iſrael, *and with the houſe of* Judah: *Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of* Egypt *(which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them, ſaith the Lord:) But this ſhall be the Covenant that I will make with the houſe of* Iſrael; *after thoſe days (ſaith the Lord) I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they ſhall be my people, and they ſhall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, ſaying; Know the Lord; for they ſhall all know me from the leaſt of them to the greateſt of them, ſaith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their ſin no more.* In which Texts, a neceſſity of ſupernatural grace, for the ends mentioned, is abundantly ſet out unto us: Had man power left in nature for this work, or nature ſo repaired in all, that abilities were univerſally conferred, this declaration needed not. No reaſon can be given of theſe engagements, by thoſe that deny any neceſſity of an Omnipotent concurrence. Theſe are uſually called Promiſes, and they runne indeed, in the nature of Promiſes; ſo that they deſerve not blame, that ſo conceive of them. Generally taken alſo to be abſolute Promiſes, ſaith Mr *Baxter*; *Aph. of Juſt. page* 9. and being Promiſes, they muſt indeed be abſolute ones, we bring not the condition of faith to accept of them; Here is nothing prerequired, as in Promiſes that are conditional; Being Promiſes, (if Promiſes) of Grace, as ſome have diſtinguiſhed, and not Promiſes to Grace; they are ſpoken to thoſe that are in their unbelief and unregenerate condition; Yet that which is neceſſarily required to make up a full Promiſe here is wanting; In Promiſes (properly ſo called) ſome may claim their intereſt, and know themſelves to be within their verge, and conclude the thing in Promiſe (upon termes at leaſt) to be theirs, which here none can do. This indeed

Jer. 31. 33. cleated.

concernes the Elect; but being in unregeneration, they know not their Election, it is not as yet made sure by them. So that as to us it is without any determinate object; None can say, my interest is in this Promise. These were delivered to the whole body of *Israel*; when not one in many, did reap the benefit of them. Mr. *Baxter* therefore makes them Prophecies, *De eventu, Prophecies of what shall happen.* I suppose they may be fitly called, the declaration or indication of Gods work, in the conditions to which he engages, and of the necessary concurrence, of the power of his grace, in that which he requires: As *Austin* and others have interpreted, that which is affirmed of our Saviour, *That he is the true light, which enlightneth every man that comes into the world*, John 1.9. not to be so understood, that all in the world are enlightned by him, for many are in darkness; but that all that are enlightned, have light by his light, explaining it with this similitude: Such a School-master teacheth all the children in a Town; that is, all that are taught, he teacheth. Some go to no School at all, so, these Promises, *I will circumcise your heart, and the heart of your seed*; All of their seed that are circumcised in heart, he circumcises, and so in all the other, none of all these are done without his special work. This was little heeded by the generality of the people of the Jews; if they minded duty, it was well, they little thought of assistance through grace; Tugging it out by their own strength, and looking for no more from heaven, than that which they had in hand; Therefore entring Covenant; and walking in their own strength; they brake Covenant, and were never able to rise to the duties of it, as is hinted in that of *Jeremy*. Therefore God promises a new covenant, in which there shall be a full discovery, and right understanding, of the meaning of the Covenant; *I will write my Law in their hearts, I will put it into their inward parts.* So that as the commandment of love was a new commandment; so this covenant was a new covenant, both given of old, both a new cleared, for a right understanding. *There was nothing wrong* (saith Mr. *Dixon*) *in the former Covenant, but it was imperfect, and all things in it were not expressed clearly.* Annot. on *Heb.* 8.7. That which was chiefly defective (as it seems) was this here mentioned, and therefore Mr. *Baxter* sayes well, that this place doth comprize but part of the covenant, not the whole, though he be taken up by another for it in these words, *God saying expressely, this*

is my Covenant; to say it is not, is not to interpret the Word, but to deny it; God sayes to the People of *Israel*, *Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickednesse, to undo every burden?* If any one should interpret that Text, would he say the whole of a Religious Fast, is there expresst, and a full definition of a Fast laid down? or would he instead of interpreting, deny that Scripture? So also that of *James*, Jam. 1. 26. *Pure religion and undefiled before God the Father, is this; To visit the fatherlesse and the widow, and to keep a man unspotted of the world.* Will any say, that the whole of Religion is set out in that Scripture, or will he be put to it, to deny the Scripture? I suppose he would rather say, that that which those Jews (to whom *Isay* speaks) did in & use to do Religious Fasts with supply of that which *Isay* calls for (in which they were defective) makes up a Religious Fast compleat. That which the scattered Tribes did in Religion, with what *James* further calls for, would render a man entirely Religious: So also that of *Jeremy* 22. 15, 16. *Shalt thou reigne, because thou closest thy self in Cedar? Did not thy father, eat and drink, and do justice and judgment, and then it was well with him? He judged the cause of the poor and needy, and then it was well with him; was not this to know me, saith the Lord?* Will any say, that that was all the knowledge that *Josiah* had of God? or will he say rather, that this was an evident proof of the sincerity of it, so I say, that which the Jews already understood to be in the covenant, together with that which those places of *Jeremy* and the *Hebrews* further hold forth, set out the entire nature of a covenant; and so in all of them, Scripture is interpreted, not denied. And whereas one affirmes, that there is no condition on mans part, in those texts in question, an adversary of all conditions on mans part in the covenant replyes. *If you mean such conditions that God requireth of us, yet worketh in us; it is there punctually expresst.* As Gods work, it is there indeed expresst; but not as our duty, which lame understanding of the covenant, hath wrought as much mischief in our age; (setting up free grace, without any eye upon his sovereignty, looking at Gods work, and not at all on mans duty) as their looking at duty in that age without eye had to the power of grace, to enable for it. Hence are those desperate counsels; *Sit still, do nothing; doing undoes you*: and that not toward *Dilemma. Art thou out of Christ, thou mayst break thy heart in working, and profit nothing:*

thing: *Art thou in Christ, then all is wrought to thy hands.* And so doing still is vain; and Mr. *Baxters Questionists* like demands. *How can you make it appear that according to the new Covenant we must act for life, and not only from life; or that a man may make his attaining of life, the end of his work, and not rather obey it out of thankfulness and love?* To which I suppose he hath received a satisfying, and (if throughly weighed,) a sadning answer, *Appendix, p. 78. 79, &c.*

Fifthly, This appears in that differencing work, which is seen among men here in the flesh. There is a great difference between those that are of God, and those that are in the world, that lies in wickedness. This is from the power of grace, enabling to answer to that unto which God in covenant calls, and not from the different improvement of any power of man, or the exercise of that freedome of will, which together with the whole species of mankind he hath received. The Apostle puts the question, *Who hath made thee to differ?* 1 Cor. 4. 7. In which he intends to stop all mouths from boasting, as appears in the next words; If any therefore shall answer in *Grevenchovius* his words (as I have seen them quoted, or in any words that hold out or inferre the same thing,) *I make my self to differ*: The Apostle will not sit down by it, He expressely tells us; *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth; but of God that sheweth mercy.* Rom 9. 16. If grace makes the difference and not man; then grace enables man to go higher than his own power, and to go higher than any power that can be in any other. Seclude this differencing grace, and the praise will be wholly mans. That any have power and possibility for good, (according to these Divines) may be of God; but that any is better than another it is from self that makes to differ.

Bradwardine hath to this purpose a notable similitude, a *If a son (saith he) being a souldier, should receive from his father a commission and armes, together with natural abilities for war, and*

a *Si filius miles acceptis à patre naturalibus, ordine atque armis strenuè militaret, sicque forsitan in superbia erigeretur influtus; quomodo in ipso eradicaretur superbia, & plantaretur humilitas? Si ei ab aliquo diceretur, Non glorietur omnis miles in conspectu patris sui; Ex ipso enim est in militia. ut qui gloriatur in patre suo glorietur, & quid habes quod non accepisti? Si autem accepisti, quid gloriaris quasi non acceperis? Posset enim rationaliter respondere dicendo, quare non deberem de mea militia gloriari? Accepi quidem à patre meo naturalia mea, quia nullus generat semetipsum; accepi & ordinem, quia nulli conceditur insignire semetipsum; accepi & arma, quia similitur & cæteri militum non nascebar armatus, nec sum faber armorum: debitum tamen usum istorum, qui omnibus prævalet non accepi ab alio, sed habeo me ex meipso, crebas victorias fama celebri divulgatas non accepi ab alio sed habeo ex meipso. Pro hujusmodi igitur in me ipso merito gloriabor, in alio autem nihil. sic & de quolibet milite Jesu Christi. fighting*

fighting ſtoutly ſhould be puffed up and grow proud: How may this pride, ſaith he, be beaten down, and humility planted? If any one ſhould ſay to him, Let not any ſouldier glory in the ſight of his father; for what he is in armes, he is from him: So that he that glorieth, let him glory in his father; for what haſt thou that thou haſt not received? He might very well and rationally anſwer (ſaith our learned Authour,) *why ſhould not I glory of my atcheivments in armes? I have received natural abilities indeed from my father, for none doth beget himſelf; I have received a commiſſion from him, for none may put himſelf into any ſuch power; I have received alſo armes from him, for neither I, nor any other ſouldier was born armed; neither am I any armourer. But the right uſe of all theſe which is above all, I had from none but my ſelf, and not in any other; and ſo every ſouldier of Jeſus Chriſt.* Brad. De cauſa Dei. lib. 2, cap. 23. ad finem. That is, he may vapour againſt God, upon ſuch ſuppoſal as this ſouldier vapours againſt his father. If acts of grace make to differ and ſtop the mouth of all boaſting; then it is grace that enables unto theſe covenant-duties and engagements.

Sixthly, This appears by the abſurdities that will follow upon denial of this doctrine of the concurrence of grace in the work of mans ſalvation. 1. Man being left to the power of his own will, to anſwer to the termes of the covenant (ſo that all ſhall be ſuſpended according to mans improvement to will or nill, to be active or idle, willing or diſobedient,) when the event in all, even in the Elect muſt reſt doubtful; when Chriſt hath done all in the work of mans ſalvation, it might (notwithſtanding all ſuch work of his) ſo fall out, that he had effected nothing. He might have been a Saviour, and not one man in the world have been ſaved; He might have been a Head, without any one member; a Shepherd, and not a ſheep in his flock; a Lord, and never a one to have done him any ſervice. It might have ſo fallen out, that he might never have been able to have ſaid to the Father; *I, and the children that thou haſt given, &c.* This is evident; As ſome have withſtood, ſo might others; As the moſt withſtand, ſo might all. Yea, it would have been no otherwiſe, If Gods Miniſters ſhould go forth, and the hand of the Lord not with them to work men to beleeve, *Acts.* 11.21. But this is full againſt Gods covenant with Chriſt, which muſt ſtand firme and inviolably remain. *He ſhall ſee his ſeed, he ſhall prolong his dayes; the*

Neceſſity of the concurrence of grace.

the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand, Isa. 53. 10, 11 *Therefore it is of grace, that it may be sure*; not of man, that it should be doubtful. 2. Then it will also follow, the work of mans salvation begins in an act; not in an habit; in somewhat that a man does respective to God, and not in any thing that God does in and upon man. The first beginning work will be ascribed to him that wills and runs, not to him that shews mercy. But this is contrary to all Gospel-Revelations, concerning the way of our change: *I will circumcise thy heart, that thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, &c.* Deut. 30.6. *I will write my Law in their hearts, and put it into their inward parts,* as Jer 31.33. *No man can come to me, except the Father draw him,* Joh. 6.44. *I will take away their hearts of stone, and give them hearts of flesh,* Ezek 36. 26. If man were alone in the work, or had the priorety before any power infused, there had been none of these undertakings. 3. This will make vain and void the prayers of the people of God, which in the Scripture is put into their mouths; *Draw me, and we will runne,* Cant. 1.4. *Turn thou us, O Lord, and so shall we be turned,* Lament. 5.21. *Create in me a clean heart, and renue a right spirit*; acknowledging their own weakness to do, and a necessity of grace to effect, what in order to their salvation is called for.

7ly. If the Apostle may be heard, his authority will put it out of question, Exhorting *to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling*, which is done no other way than in coming up to that which God calls for in covenant, he gives in his reason for encouragement; *It is God that works in us the will and the deed.* The special hand and power of God concurring in this work, is our encouragement from the Apostle to set upon it. How can he encourage to this work upon this account that God works in us, to will and to do, if there were not a work of God upon us before there be any such work done by us? We work, but he sets us on working; We will, but he sets us on willing; Let all the glosses that have ever been put upon these words to promote the will and work of man; and enervate the free grace of God, in the great concernments of salvation, be examined, and they will all fall of themselves before this Text of the Apostle. See Dr. *Ward* in his Sermon called *Gratia discriminans.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

Objections againſt the former doctrine anſwered.

BUt ſome ſay, Abſurdities, and thoſe not a few follow upon this Doctrine. *Then ſalvation in this new Covenant, is as impoſſible for a man, as in the old, had he ſtill remained under a Covenant of Works. If we can no more riſe up to the termes of the Covenant of grace than we can to the Covenant of works, where then is the difference?* *Object.* 1.

To which I anſwer; that a man void of grace can no more be ſaved by the Covenant of Grace, than a man under an impoſſibility to work can be ſaved by the Covenant of Works, will eaſily be granted. *By grace we are ſaved*, Epheſ. 2. 8. *not of our ſelves.* It is ſtill equally impoſſible in both to be ſelf-ſaviours. Here is the difference. Grace raiſes us, unto that to which the Goſpel calls us, in a ſelf-denying way through faith; but works us not to that ſelf perfection in thoſe degrees of inherent righteouſneſſe, as to be ſaved by works. *Anſw.*

Secondly, *This doctrine layes man as low as a ſtock or a ſtone; a dead carcaſſe, nothing is done by him but what is done in him, and ſo muſt needs be injurious to man.* To this I anſwer. Firſt, it layes him no lower than ſin hath caſt him, nor doth it make him worſe than ſin hath made him, and the Word of God doth diſcover him, and that is dead till grace quicken and raiſe him. His heart is of ſtone till grace, take it from him, and in enmity againſt God, till grace circumciſe and work that change, to love the Lord with all the heart, &c. Secondly, This is not an abſolute death, in which man is, through ſin, and therefore the ſimilitude holds not, that equals a ſtock, ſtone, or dead carcaſſe with him; It is only a death reſpective, as to ſpiritual obedience he is dead; There is in him a life natural, able for all actions and motions of the life of man as man. There is in him alſo a moral life, able to improve naturals to a civilized converſation. That to which feare or hope can work a man, thither he may raiſe himſelf by the freedome of will, this puts no new life into him, nor works any chang of nature in him. He is alſo able for thoſe works which God ſanctifies as his inſtrument, for the work of a ſpiritual life, He can read and hear the Word, hath power to know much in it, and retain it. Thirldy, he is a ſubject ſuſcep- *Object.* 2. *Anſw.*

tible, ſtands in a capacity of a life of grace, of ſpiritual actions and motions: having an underſtanding, will, affections, wanting not any faculties in their ſubſtance. The new man attaines not a new ſoul, but only renewed qualifications, which yet are of more glory, than the faculties themſelves, carrying ſuch a glorious reſemblance of God. Better know nothing than not know God, to deſire nothing, than not to deſire good. The want of this, turned Angels into Devils, and ſo man ſtands in a vaſt difference from ſtocks, ſtones and thoſe to whom he is thus injuriouſly compared. This doctrine is not injurious to man, as it is traduced.

Object. 3. Thirdly, ſome ſay, *This will render preaching vaine, all mans paines for Converſion of ſoules will then prove uſeleſſe, and to no purpoſe; we may let men alone till God work; and when he hath begun his work, they will ſet on working.* This indeed ſpeaks hard to a ſort of men in our times; that deny any previous working in the ſoul for regeneration, or any preparatory work to converſion, So that all unconverted, ſtand equally diſtant from the grace of it, in ſo much that it can be ſaid of no one rather than another, which Chriſt ſaid to the Scribe, *Thou art not far from the Kingdome of God*, Mar. 12.34. I ſee not how theſe can make the preaching of the word of any uſe; Our Brethren that went into *America*, and offer the Goſpel to ſavage Indians there, may as well finde Chriſt there, as bring him thither. The dark places of the earth may be equally happy, with thoſe, where light is in moſt glory, if light contribute nothing to the work of change, and the happy frame of Chriſt in us. But thoſe that have learnt, that infuſed habits are wrought in the ſoul in the ſame manner, as thoſe that are acquired, may eaſily return a ſatisfying anſwer. That opinion, that the ſoul is by an immediate creation infuſed, how generally ſoever it is received, yet never was thought of force to render the way of marriage uſeleſſe for procreation; God infuſes not a ſoul by creation into any, but an organized body, an Embryo fitted to receive it. Neither can this opinion of the power of grace in the work of Converſion, render in vain the labours of thoſe that are ſpiritual Parents. Conviction is in order before Converſion, and men muſt ſee themſelves neceſſitated to do what they do, before ever they enter upon it. The ſoule knoweth what it doth, when it firſt beleeves, and ſees a neceſſity to accept Chriſt before it receives

Habitus infuſi infunduntur ad modum acquiſitorum.

ceives him, which is the work of the Word in the soules, of those that are brought to Christ Jesus. It is not in vaine for God to send his Ministers to shew the mysteries of the Kingdome of heaven to those that are blinde, when this is the way of God to open their eyes and give them sight. It is not in vain that he sends them to those that are without strength, when this is his way to enable them with power. It is not in vain that *Paul* plants, and *Apollos* waters, when yet it is God that gives the increase, when God will use *Paul* and *Apollos* for the increase that he gives. Ministers should perswade, and people improve endeavours as though they were *Pelagians*, and no help of grace afforded, They should pray and beleeve, and rest on grace as though they were *Antinomians*, nothing of endeavour to be looked after; So the injury that the *Pelagian* doth to grace, and the *Antinomian* to our endeavours, will be on both hands avoided.

CHAP. XX.

Farther differences in the conditions in the Covenant of Works, and the conditions in the Covenant of Grace.

2'y. THe conditions, on mans part in the Covenant of Works, kept man within himself for righteousnesse. That righteousnesse in which he was to stand in Gods sight, was inherent, wrought by himself, co-natural to him, flowing from the principles of his creation, in conformity to God. And therefore properly his own; as now a mans reason, will and affections are properly his, He needed no other, nor no more righteousnesse than that in which he stood. Though he had that faith which now serves to justifie, yet it needed not, nor could be improved to take in any other righteousnesse without himself for justification. Man stood then on his own bottome. His dependance was on God for being, but that being, which God pleased to communicate, was in that integrity and purity, that he needed not any farther. But the conditions of the Covenant of Grace, carry man out

The conditions in the Covenant of Works kept man within himself for righteousnesse.

The conditions in the Covenant of Grace, carry a man out of himself to be righteous by anothers righteousnesse.

of himself, He must be righteous with a righteousnes extrinsecal, or else he will never be able to stand in judgment. *Paul* was as high, as he that was higheſt, in that righteouſneſſe, which he could lay claime to, as his own, wrought by himſelf, as well before converſion as after. Before converſion he was as high, as a Phariſee, or a Jew according to the letter could reach, either in priviledges, or duties; as we may ſee in that gradation of his, *Phil.* 3. *Circumciſed*, and therefore of the body of the people of God, and no alien from the Common-wealth of *Iſrael*; *Circumciſed the eighth day*, and therefore born of Parents in the ſame Church-communion; *Of the ſtock of Iſrael*, and ſo the ſeed of *Abraham*, and not deſcended of anceſtors that had been Proſelytes; *Of the Tribe of Benjamin*, of that part of *Iſrael* that held the truth of worſhip; of whom was ſalvation, and not of the Apoſtated tribes; *An Hebrew of the Hebrews*, and therefore had not forgotten the language of *Canaan*; *As touching the Law, a Phariſee*, a man of no vulgar account, but of the moſt exquiſite Sect; *Concerning zeal, perſecuting the Church*, therefore not luke-warme or cold in the faith; *As touching the righteouſneſſe that is of the Law blameleſſe*, therefore of a converſation exact, walk up to his principles. After converſion, *he knew nothing by himſelf*, 1 Cor. 4. 4. His heart condemned him not, *He exerciſed himſelf continually to have a conſcience void of offence, both to God and man*, Acts 24. 16. Yet he durſt reſt, in none of theſe, *I am not* (ſaith he) *hereby juſtified*, 1 Cor. 4. 4. *What things were gain to me, thoſe I counted loſſe for Chriſt; yea, doubtleſſe, and I count all things but loſſe for the excellency of the knowledg of Chriſt Jeſus my Lord; for whom I have ſuffered the loſſe of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Chriſt, and be found in him, not having my own righteouſneſſe, which is of the Law, but that which is through faith of Chriſt, the righteouſneſſe which is of God by faith*, Philip. 3. 7, 8, 9. The ignorance of this, was the bane of the body of the Jewiſh Nation. *The Gentiles which followed not after righteouſneſſe, have attained to righteouſneſſe, even the righteouſneſſe which is of faith. But* Iſrael *which followed after the Law of righteouſneſſe, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſſe; wherefore? becauſe they ſought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law*, Rom. 9. 30, 31, 32. *For they being ignorant of Gods righteouſneſſe, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſſe,*

neſſe, have not ſubmitted themſelves unto the righteouſneſſe of God, Rom. 10 3. And ſtill, it is the undoing of a great part of the world; Man being naturally inclined, to look after a righteouſneſſe of his own, and extreamely oppoſite to this righteouſneſſe, which in the covenant of grace is tendered, and by which in a Goſpel-way he muſt be ſaved. The righteouſneſſe of the former covenant, was wrote in the heart by nature; and ſuch remainders left, that the man that minds any righteouſneſſe, alone looks after it. But this, is onely of Revelation, He muſt have light without him to lead to this righteouſneſſe, which is not his own, nor inherent in him: What naturally he did not know, he is naturally ready to oppoſe and refuſe. Men know not how, till they be taught of God, to ſee a reaſon of it; or to underſtand that it is of any uſe. A man may be wiſe with another mans wit, ſtrong with another mans ſtrength, learned by another mans knowledge, as well as righteous (as they conceive) by another mans righteouſneſſe: Hence are the ſcornes that are put upon it, and the Treatiſes that are wrote againſt it; *Vain man would faine be ſomewhat, as wiſe,* Job 11.12. *ſo alſo righteous.* This takes all from man, ſtrips him of all in, which he may glory, as *Romans* 3.27. This which man ſo oppoſeth, the covenant of grace eſtabliſheth; And that which he ſo advanceth, the covenant of grace diſclaimes.

The conditions in the Covenant of works were for mans preſervation in preſent happineſſe.

3. *The conditions on mans part in the covenant of works were for mans preſervation in* ſtatu quo, *in that condition in which he was created,* To hold him in communion with God, which was his happineſſe; he expected not to be bettered by his obedience, either reſpective to happineſſe (no more is promiſed than in preſent he had,) nor yet in his qualifications reſpective to his conformity to God in righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe. What improvement he might have made of the habit infuſed, by the exerciſe of obedience; I ſhall not determine, But no change in qualifications was looked after, or given in promiſe.

The conditions in the Covenant of grace are for mans reparation.

The conditions of the covenant of grace are ſerviceable to man in his return to God, for his recovery, as to his ſtate of happineſſe loſt; ſo to the repaire or new frame of his qualifications depraved and ſpoiled. This is plain of it ſelf, and will be further explained

plained in that which follows, Other differences there are assigned by Divines to difference these two covenants; some of which fall in with these that I have mentioned, and some to which I cannot in all things consent. See *Camero de triplici fœdere.* 1 *Thes.* 9. * These I thought to be most material, and with these I shall rest satisfied.

CHAP. XXI.

Faith is a condition of the Covenant of Grace.

HAVING asserted conditions, in the covenant of grace, and held forth several differences between the conditions, in the covenant of works, and in the covenant of grace, we are now further to enquire, what these conditions are, that are called for in this covenant, on which we treat: Those Divines, that with concurrent judgments, acknowledge this covenant to be conditional, are not yet, so unanimous, in their assignation of them. For a full discovery, some things are to be premised, as truths taken for granted, rather than disputed. 1. That God covenants with man, and engages himself to him, not onely for justification, but also for salvation. Not onely for pardon of sinne, but everlasting life and glory. Not onely to be reconciled to him; but to conferre eternal happinesse upon him. 2. Whatsoever God requires of man, in order, either to his justification, or salvation, without which he is not justified, or saved, and man engages unto, in order to his justification, or salvation, this is a covenant condition. This I take to be clear, in case there be any such thing, as a condition in any covenant, and it is also granted by a professed adversary of all conditions in the covenant of grace, *faith and repentance are* (saith he) *means, of our enjoying the comforts of the covenant, but not conditions going out of the nature of a covenant; for every means, is not a condition, though every condition be a means; but, when a means is by stipulation, and contract appointed; for the acquiring of any thing, then it is a condition.* Whatsoever then we can finde, thus required of God, in this way of contract, and stipulation; is a condition by the confession of our adversaries. 3. Whatsoever is required of man, in

in order to his juſtification, is a condition of his juſtification, and all that is required, in order to his eternal ſalvation, is, a condition of ſalvation, God making tender of both, and man engaging himſelf to ſeek both, whatſoever is required in order to either, reſpective to that, is a condition. 4. That, which is a condition of juſtification, is alſo a condition of ſalvation, in that, ſalvation preſuppoſes a juſtified eſtate; but, it holds not on the contrary, that, which is, a condition of ſalvation, is not therefore a condition of juſtification. More is required, to hold us up, in conſtant communion with God, then to bring us into a ſtate of actual reconcilement to God. This being premiſed, the work will be more eaſie, to aſſigne conditions in this covenant. The condition, immediately ſerviceable, for mans return to a reconciled ſtate with God; and conſequently of his juſtification, is faith, which almoſt all acknowledge to be a condition, and *Camero*, with ſeveral others, makes it to be, the ſole condition of the covenant. A condition it is, as, is above contradiction, *John* 3.15,16. *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his onely begotten Son, that, whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life*, Mark 16.16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved; but, he that beleeveth not, ſhall be damned.* Acts 10.43. *To him, give all the Prophets witneſſe, that thorough his name; whoſoever believeth in him, ſhall receive remiſſion of ſinnes*, Acts 13. 38, 39. *Be it known unto you therefore men, and brethren; that through this man, is preached unto you forgiveneſſe of ſinnes. And by him, all that beleeve, are juſtified from all things from which, ye could, not be juſtified, by the Law of Moſes*, Acts 16. 31. *Believe on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt and thou ſhalt be ſaved, and thy whole houſe*, Rom. 3.25. *Whom God hath ſet forth, to be a propitiation through faith in his blood*, Rom. 10.4. *Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs, to every one that believeth.* In all theſe texts, and ſeveral others, faith is required of men, in covenant, and if men did not engage to beleeve, they could not be ſo much as profeſſed covenanters. This is in reaſon further evident.

1. That which gives us intereſt in the Mediator of the covenant, without which we have no title to him, or portion in him, is a condition of the covenant: This is plain of it ſelf, without intereſt in the Mediator of the covenant, we are as though no covenant were entred, and the former diſtance held up. But it is faith that gives us intereſt

Reaſons convincing Faith to be a condition of the Covenant of grace.

intereſt in Chriſt the Mediatour, He dwells in us by faith, *Epheſ.* 3.17. *He is ſet forth a propitiation through Faith in his blood*; They that believe receive him, *John* 1. 12. Others hold a diſtance from him; *To as many as received him, to them he gave power to be the ſonnes of God, even to thoſe that beleeve in his Name.*

2. That which receives all that grace gives, muſt needs be a condition of the covenant of grace; This is as plain, to be under a covenant of grace, and void of the gifts of grace is a vain entrance upon it, and the reception of the gift is a condition neceſſarily requiſite. But Faith receives all that grace gives; It is of Fath that it might be of grace, *Rom.* 4.16. God gives nothing, at leaſt tending to eternity, but he puts it into the hands of Chriſt; He is the Fathers treaſury and ſtore-houſe, *Col.* 1. 19. *It pleaſed the Father that in him all fulneſſe ſhould dwell. And that of his fulneſſe we ſhould all receive*, *Joh.* 1.16. And faith receives al from him, *He that believeth, out of his belly flowes rivers of living water.* Joh. 7.38.

3. That which intereſts us in, and gives title to all priviledges, of a people in covenant with God through Chriſt, is a condition of the covenant: This is plaine, the end of the covenant being to conferre thoſe priviledges upon us; But Faith intereſts us in, and gives title to all theſe priviledges, *Paul* is ſent to the Gentiles, to turne them *from Satan to God; to bring them out of Satans kingdome*, and to bring them in a covenant-way into Chriſts Kingdome, *That they may receive forgiveneſſe of ſins, and an inheritance among them that are ſanctified* (ſaith Chriſt) *by faith that is in me.* Chriſt is the object of a Chriſtians faith, on whom it is terminated; Faith which is in Chriſt, receives that leading priviledg, forgiveneſſe of ſins; without this priviledge we are ſtrangers to all other priviledges; Being under ſinne, we are heires of wrath, and in no capacity of mercy. Faith intereſts us in this. *Acts* 10. 43. *To him give all the Prophets witneſſe, that through his Name, whoſoever believeth in him, ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins.* Acts 13. 39. *And by him, all that beleeve are juſtified, from all things from which ye could not be juſtified by the Law of Moſes.* Rom. 3. 25. *Whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteouſneſſe for the remiſſion of ſinnes that are paſt, through the forbearance of God.* Faith intereſts us in the conſummating

mating priviledge, an inheritance among them that are ſanctified. *He that believeth hath everlaſting life, John* 6.40. Faith intereſts us in all intermediate priviledges, which a man in covenant can enjoy in the way to this inheritance. Adoption of ſonnes is this way obtained, *John* 1.12. *Gal.*3.26. Pacification of Spirit, Serenity and tranquility of minde, *Iſa.*26.3. *Rom.*5.1. Boldneſſe at the throne of grace, *Epheſ.* 3. 12. There is no priviledge bottomed on Chriſt, that hath foundation in him, but Faith receives, Faith then muſt be a condition of the covenant.

4. That which puts into a capacity to receive the mercies of the covenant; held forth in Promiſe, is a condition of the covenant, and the want of it ſtrips off all hope and expectation of it; But Faith puts into a capacity to receive all the graces of the covenant given in promiſe; *Said I not unto thee, if thou wilt beleeve, thou ſhalt ſee the glory of God?* John 11.40. God exerts and glorifies his power in great things for good unto thoſe that exerciſe the grace of Faith. *Paul ſaw the Creeple had faith to be healed.* Acts 14. 9. Sure if there be ſuch a thing as a condition in any covenant, in the world any ſuch thing as a conditional covenant, then ſure faith is a condition of the covenant of grace; Some conceive an abſolute covenant made of God for grace, as *Jer.* 31. 33. This with me is very diſputable, and I have given my reaſons. But the covenant made to grace, muſt needs ſuppoſe grace. There is no covenant for happineſſe made with any creature, but upon termes and conditions.

In what ſenſe faith is here taken.

For further clearing of this point, we muſt know that faith is conſidered under a double notion. Firſt, as an inſtrument, or (if that word will not be allowed) as the way of our intereſt in Chriſt, and priviledges by Chriſt. Secondly, as an inherent grace or Chriſtian duty to which both the Law and the Goſpel call. The radical grace from which others flow, though not in their being, yet in their farther growth and encreaſe. I ſpeak of Faith now in the firſt acception. Neither as a part, or any way a working cauſe, of the farther progreſſe in inherent righteouſneſſe, ſo it will come in the ſecond place, but as intereſting us in another righteouſneſſe, and ſo I ſay it is a condition in the covenant of grace, immediately ſerviceable for our returne to God, and reconciliation in Chriſt. For clear-

Propositions tending to clear the point in hand.

ring of which, I shall clear it in some propositions.

First, *God will by no means justifie a wicked person, no man in sin shall stand and live in his sight.* He that hath made a Law to forbid it, ordained hell for the punishment of it, will not justifie the person that is convinced and found guilty of it. Some say it is against his essence. The justice of God (which is God) ties him to take vengeance, sure I am it is against his declaration of himself, *Exod.* 34.7. when he sets out his name in several particulars, this is one, *by no means clearing the guilty.* Some indeed have said (conceiting with themselves thereby to promote free grace,) that God justifies sinners as sinners, which, as it must needs, if true, bring in the salvation of all, *à quatenus ad omne valet argumentum*, then a man need no more but sinne, to conclude his salvation, and the more sinne, the stronger evidence; so, it is utterly destructive to the Gospel, and overthrows the whole work of Christs merit, as the Apostle saith, *If righteousnesse be by the Law, then, Christ is dead in vaine.* Galatians 2.21. So we may safely say, If a man be justified as a sinner without a righteousnesse. So that the truth is, God justifies as righteous, what he esteems as an abomination in man, that he doth not himself; but this in man is an abomination to him; *He that justifieth the wicked, and condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord,* Proverbs 17.15.

Secondly, *Man hath no righteousnesse of his owne, to bring in plea for his justification, in which he can appeare before God in judgment.* This will be plaine if we consider the wayes of acquital where proceedings are just and legal. This must be, either as innocent, when a man can plead not guilty to that which is given in charge; So did *David* when *Cush*, the Benjamite did traduce him, *Psalm.* 7.3. *If I have done this, if there be iniquity in my hands.* — And so did *Paul* to the charge of *Tertullus*, Acts 24.13. Upon this account *Pilate* was willing to have acquitted Christ, *I finde no fault in this man*, Luke 23.4. Or else by way of satisfaction or discharge of the penalty which the Law imposeth, so in all penal Lawes, when the penalty is borne, the delinquent is discharged. Man cannot be acquitted as innocent, his guilt is too palpable. *There is no man that sinneth not*, (saith *Solomon*) 1 Kings 8.4, 6. The Scripture hath concluded all under sinne,

Gal.

Gal. 3. 22. The Law ſpeaks that language, *that every mouth may be ſtopped, and all the world may become guilty before God*, Rom. 3. 19. Man is under that guilt that he is wholly ſilenced; which renders the way of ſalvation by works impoſſible. Neither can he be acquitted by way of ſatisfaction; where the way of pure juſtice is held, the debtor under charge can never come out till he hath paid the uttermoſt farthing, *Mat.* 5. 26. Which here amounts to ſuch an heighth, that man may be ever paying, but never able to ſatisfie: Our guilt is according to the majeſty of him, whoſe Law is tranſgreſſed, and wrath incurred. This is ſeen in Devils and damned ſouls, who bear in their own perſons the reward due to their ſinnes. That man, that muſt ſuffer it in his own perſon, may well ſay with *Cain*, *My puniſhment is greater then I can bear*, Gen. 4. 13.

Thirdly, *Man in this ſad and perplexed eſtate, hath yet a righteouſneſſe of grace tendered him, a righteouſneſſe without the Law, but witneſſed by the Law and the Prophets*, Rom. 3. 21. And this is by way of diſcharge of his guilt by anothers ſuffering; Our name was in the Obligation in caſe of ſinne to ſuffer death, Chriſt was pleaſed (by conſent and covenant with the Father) to put in his; and as he was thus obliged, ſo he *ſuffered, the juſt for the unjuſt, that he might bring us to God*, 1 Pet. 3. 18. We brake the Law, and he bore the penalty, whether *idem* or *tantundem*, the ſame in ſpecie, or the ſame in value, is ſcarce worth diſpute, So that it be yeelded that juſtice was anſwered, and the Father ſatisfied, and that we come out not on our own, but our ſureties account. And this (as I yet conceive) is by Chriſts paſſive obedience; His ſuffering in the fleſh is our freedom, his death is our ranſome. There needs no more than innocency not to die, and when guilt is taken away, we ſtand as innocent, no crime then can be charged upon us. But to reign in life (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) to inherit a crown, there is farther expected, which we not reaching, Chriſts active obedience imputed to us (not adding to ours (but being in it ſelf compleat) is accounted ours, and we are diſcharged.

And whereas ſome ſay, *that being freed from death, upon that very account we reigne in life, and therefore in caſe his ſufferings, deliver us from death, they neceſſarily confer upon us life, there is not, nor can there be conceived any* medium *between them.* *Object.*

Answ. I answer, It is true of our natural life and death, A man not dead, is alive. But taking [death] in Scripture-sense, for the wages of sin, which comprizes (as we have heard) all misery, and [life] for an immarcessible crown of glory, there may be a *medium* conceived between them, and is not onely conceived, but assigned by Papists in their *Limbus infantum*. Neither will it serve to say that Christs active obedience, served onely for a qualification to fit him for the work of suffering; none but innocent man free from sin, could be a sacrifice for sinne, seeing Christ had been innocent, though he had never come under the Law, to have yeelded that obedience. His person had not been, as ours, under the Law, unlesse of his own accord he *had been made under the Law*, *Gal.* 4.4. Somewhat might be said for the subjection of the humane nature in Christ, the manhood of Christ, which was a creature, but the person of Christ God-man, seemes to be above subjection. Much may be said for the subjection of the Sonne of *David*, so considered, he may say with *David*, *I am thy servant, and the sonne of thy handmaid*, but not so of the Lord of *David*, had he not for our sakes made himself a servant; We know the mortality of the humane nature, yet Christ had never died, unlesse he had made himself obedient unto death, neither needed he to have served unlesse he had humbled himself, *Phil.* 2. to take upon him the forme of a servant. See the confession of Faith, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines, *chap.* 8. *sect* 5. and Dr. *Featlies* speeches upon it.

Fourthly, *This righteousnesse of Christ, whether passive or active, or both passive and active, is made ours by faith.* This is our way of interest and appropriation of it to our selves, Faith and no other grace, this grace and no other Gospel-work, gives us title; and therefore, as it is called *the righteousnesse of God*, so, also *the righteousnesse of faith*; These two, are promiscuously used and taken, for one another, *Rom.* 10.3,4. *Phil* 3.8. Called the righteousnesse of God, being the free gift of God, wrought by Christ who is God, denied to be our own righteousnesse, being neither wrought by us, or inherent in us, called the righteousnesse of faith, not of works, not of love, not of patience, or meekness. It is alone faith, and none of these graces that puts out it selfe to receive it; love in a graciously disposed soul, cleaves to Christ for communion, but receives him not for justification. These

two

two ſtand as relatives, there is no ſoul entituled to this righteouſneſſe, but by faith; and faith is it that entitles to it, & the beleeving ſoul hath intereſt in it, Therefore juſtification in Scripture is aſcribed to faith, and denied to works, when neither faith, nor works can beare us out of themſelves before the tribunal of God; but faith takes hold, and the ſoul by faith reſts on this righteouſneſſe of grace, which the Goſpel tenders. It is true, that faith receives the Spirit as well as it receives the blood of *Chriſt*, *Joh.* 7. 39. *Gal.* 3. 14. But this is for another uſe, for the work of ſanctification inherent, not juſtification by righteouſneſſe imputed. And it is alſo true, that faith accepts *Chriſt* as a Lord, as well as a Saviour: But it is the acceptation of him as a Saviour, not as a Lord that juſtifies; *Chriſt* rules his people as a King, teacheth them as a Prophet, but makes atonement for them onely as a Prieſt, by giving himſelf in ſacrifice; his blood for remiſſion of ſins; Theſe muſt be diſtinguiſhed, but not divided, Faith hath an eye at all, the blood of Chriſt, the command of Chriſt, the Doctrine of *Chriſt*, but as it eyes and faſtens on his blood, ſo it juſtifies. *He is ſet out a propitiation through faith in his blood*, Romans 3. 24. not through faith in his command, *It is the blood of Chriſt that cleanſeth all ſin, and not the Sovereignty of Chriſt.* Theſe confuſions of the diſtinct parts of Chriſts Mediatourſhip; and the ſeveral offices of faith may not be ſuffered. Scripture aſſignes each its particular place and work. Sovereignty doth not cleanſe us, nor doth blood command us; faith in his blood, not faith yeelding to his Sovereignty doth juſtifie us. There are ſeveral acts or fruits of juſtifying faith, *Heb.* 11. But all are not juſtifying; It is not *Abrahams* obedience, *Moſes* ſelf-denial, *Gideon* or *Sampſons* valour that was their juſtification, but his blood (in which faith alone gives intereſt) who did enable them in theſe duties, by his Spirit. *Paul* went in theſe duties as high as they, living in more clear light, and under more abundant grace, I doubt not but he out-topt them, and yet he was not thereby juſtified, as 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *James* indeed ſaith, that *Abraham was juſtified by works, when he had offered* Iſaac *his ſon on the Altar*, James 2. 21. But either there we muſt underſtand *a working faith* with *Piſcator*, *Paraus*, *Pemble*, and others, and confeſſe that *Paul* and *James* handle two diſtinct queſtions, The one, whether faith alone juſtifies without works; which he concludes in the affirmative. The other, what faith juſtifies,

The acceptation of Chriſt as a Lord, doth not juſtifie.

whether a working faith onely, and not a faith that is dead and idle; or elſe I know not how to make ſenſe of the Apoſtle, who ſtreight inferres from *Abrahams* juſtification by the offer of his ſonne. *And the Scripture was fulfilled, that ſaith,* Abraham *beleeved God, and it was accounted to him for righteouſneſſe.* How otherwiſe do theſe accord? He was juſtified by works, and the Scripture was fulfilled, that ſaith, he was juſtified by faith; Neither can I reconcile what he ſaith, if this be denied, with the whole current of the Goſpel. The Rhemiſts indeed underſtand thoſe texts of the Apoſtle, where he excludes works from juſtification, to be meant of mans moral works, done before faith and converſion; The works of the Law done without Chriſt, *Annot. in Rom.* 3.20,28. As though the Law did not command thoſe duties, unto which Chriſt through faith ſtrengthens a Chriſtian converted by grace; And when the Apoſtle concludes the impoſſibility of being juſtified by the works of the Law, his meaning ſhould be unleſſe grace aſſiſt the Law, that it may juſtifie: This could not be, the Apoſtle calls it a righteouſneſſe of God without the Law, not a righteouſneſſe of the Law, with addition of ſtrength from the Goſpel; All works before or after converſion inherent in us, or wrought by us, are excluded from juſtification. See *Ravanellus in verbum, Juſtificatio. Num.* 3. *page* 867. This juſtification wrought freely by grace through faith, *Rom.* 3. 24. is no way conſiſtent with juſtification by works. And what the Apoſtle ſpeaks of election, we may well apply to juſtification, the ſame *medium* equally proves the truth of both, *If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwiſe grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace, otherwiſe works were no more works,* Rom 11.6. And theſe things conſidered, I am truly ſorry that faith ſhould now be denied to have the office or place of an inſtrument in our juſtification; nay, ſcarce allowed to be called the inſtrument of receiving Chriſt, that juſtifies us becauſe the act of faith (which is that which juſtifies us) is, our actual receiving Chriſt, and therefore cannot be the inſtrument of receiving. This is too ſubtile a notion: we uſe to ſpeak otherwiſe of Faith; Faith is the eye of the ſoul whereby we ſee Chriſt, and the eye is not ſight. Faith is the hand of the ſoul whereby it receives Chriſt, and the hand is not receiving. And Scripture ſpeaks otherwiſe, *We receive remiſſion of ſinnes by Faith, and an inheri-*

Faith juſtifies as an inſtrument.

heritance among them that are ſanctified is received by Faith, Acts 18.26. Why elſe is this righteouſneſſe ſometimes called the righteouſneſſe of Faith, and ſometimes the righteouſneſſe of God which is by Faith, but that it is a righteouſneſſe which Faith receives; *Chriſt dwells in us by Faith*, Epheſ. 3.17. By Faith we take him in and give him entertaintment *We receive the promiſe of the Spirit through Faith*, Gal. 3.14. Theſe Scriptures ſpeak of Faith as the ſouls inſtrument, to receive Chriſt Jeſus, to receive the Spirit from Chriſt Jeſus. The inſtrumentality of it in the work of juſtification is denied, becauſe the nature of an inſtrument (as conſidered in Phyſical operations) doth not exactly belong to it, which if it muſt be alwayes rigidly followed, will often put us to a ſtand in the aſſignation of cauſes of any kind in Moral actions, The material and formal cauſes in juſtification are ſcarce agreed upon, and no marvel then, in caſe men mind to contend about it, that ſome queſtion is raiſed about the inſtrument. But in caſe we ſhall conſider the nature and kinde of this work, about which Faith is implied, and examine the reaſon and ground upon which Faith is diſabled from the office of an inſtrument in our juſtification, and withall look into that which is brought in as an inſtrument in this work in the ſtead of it; I do not doubt but it will eaſily appear that thoſe Divines, that with a concurrent judgment (without almoſt a diſſenting voice have made Faith an inſtrument in this work) ſpeak moſt aptly and moſt agreeably to the nature of an inſtrument. The work about which Faith is implied, is not an abſolute, but a relative work, a work of God towards man, not without the actual concurrence of man, ſuch, in which neither God nor man are ſole efficients, nor any act of God or man can be ſole inſtruments, but there muſt be a mutual concurrence of both; This muſt needs be granted, unleſſe we will bring in Doctor *Criſpes* paſſive recipiency of Chriſt, Chriſts abode in man without man, in ſpight of man, and ſuppoſe him to be juſtified in unbelief; And hereupon faith is diſabled from this office in juſtification by this argument. *If Faith be an inſtrument, it is the inſtrument of God, or man.* 1. *Not of man, for man is not the principal efficient, he doth not juſtifie himſelf.* 2. *Not of God. For* (1) *It is not God that beleeveth, though it is true, God is the firſt cauſe of all actions.* (2.) *Man is the* cauſa ſecunda, *between God and the action, and ſo ſtill man ſhould be ſaid*

to

to justifie himself. (3.) *For* (*as* Aquinas) *the action of the principal cause, and of the instrument is one action; and who dare say, that faith is so Gods instrument?* (4.) *The instrument must have an influx to the producing of the effect of the principal cause, by a proper causality; & who dare say that faith hath such an influx into our justification.*

I answer, It is the instrument of man; and though man do not justifie himself, yet he concurres as a willing, ready agent with God in it; *God is a justifier of those that beleeve in Jesus,* Rom.3. 26. *God hath set Christ forth a propitiation through faith,* Rom.3.25. *It is one God which shall justifie the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith,* Rom 3.30. And because it is the instrument of man in a work of this nature, it is also an instrument of God. As some have observed a communication of Titles between Christ and his Church: (the Church being called by his Name,) so there is a communication of actions in these relative works; *Christ dwells in our hearts by faith,* Eph.3.17. We believe, and not Christ, and yet faith there is Christs instrument, whereby he takes up his abode; *God purifies the hearts of the Gentiles by faith,* Acts 15. 17. They beleeved, and not God, yet faith is Gods instrument in the work of their purification; so on the other side, the Spirit is Gods work, yet *we by the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the flesh,* Rom.8.13. Man neither justifies nor sanctifies himself, yet by faith he is raised to close with God in both; and so Faith as an instrument receives righteousnes to justification, and therefore is called the righteousnes of faith which is our justification, and works sanctification; provided you understand not the first work, which is properly regeneration, and precedent to faith, but the farther progresse and increase of it; *The Spirit working faith,* faith takes in a larger measure of the Spirit, *John* 7.37. *He that beleeveth on me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water; but this he spake of the Spirit, which they that beleeve on him, should receive.* The Spirit will do nothing without our faith, and our faith can do nothing without the Spirit; Man cannot justifie himselfe by beleeving without God, and God will not justifie an unbeleeving man. Faith then is the act of man; man beleeves, yet the instrument of God, that justifies onely beleevers; so that what is here spoken by way of exception against faith as an instrument, holds of efficients, and instruments sole and absolute in their work, and

Fides percipit justificationem, efficit sanctificationem.

and causality. But where there is a concurrence of agents, and one makes use of the act of another to produce the effect; that in such causality is wrought, it will not hold.

The promise or grant of the new Covenant in the Gospel, is (instead of faith) made the instrument in the work of justification. This is indeed Gods, and not mans. It is the covenant of God, the Promise of God, the Gospel of God; but of it self unable to raise man up to justification. It is often tendred, and justification not always wrought; & so disabled from the office of an instrument by *Kecker.* in his Com upon his first Canon, concerning an instrument.[a] *Assoon as the instrument serves not the principal agent, soscon it loses the nature of an instrument.* He instanceth in an horse that obeys not the reins of his rider, but grows refractory, then he ceaseth to be an instrument for travel. A sword is not an instrument of slaughter, where it slays not; nor an axe an instrument to hew, where it cuts not: neither is the Gospel an instrument of justification, where it justifies not, & without our faith, it never justifies. Where the Minister is a Minister of condemnation, the savour of death to death, there the Gospel becomes an instrument of condemnation and of death. The efficacy that is in the Gospel for justification, it receives by their faith to whom it is tendred. *Heb.* 4. 2. *Unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them, but the Word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it.* 1 Thes. 2. 12, 13. *You received not the Word of God (which you heard of us) as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that beleeve.* So that the Gospel in it self considered, is wanting in that honour assigned to an instrument, to have influx to the producing of the effect of the principal cause by a proper causality; If none dare say, faith hath such an influx, they may much lesse say, that the Word hath such an influx. The Gospel is an outward instrument, saith *Ravanellus*, Faith an inward; They both making up one instrument, full and compleat, yet Faith is more aptly and fitly called an instrument; Seeing that faith gives efficacy as an instrument to the Word, the Word may be without Faith, and so no instrument at all; but Faith always presupposeth the Word of Promise, & is not without its object. Therefore to wind up this whole dispute, in which I have studied to be brief, though I fear some will think I have been too tedious, Seeing that those that make Faith the instrument in justification, make the Gospel an instrument likewise, and dare not

[a] *Quàm primum ergo instrumentum, principali agenti non subservit, instrumenti naturam amittit.*

go about to strip it of its honour. I hope that they that make the Gospel an instrument, will acknowledge Faith to be an instrument in like manner; being in their efficacy as instruments so inseparably joyned, and so all the controversie may be fairely ended and concluded.

CHAP. XXII.

Objections against the conditionality of Faith answered.

Objections. AGAINST this which hath been said, it is objected by one, that *Unbelief is not a barre hindring one, from having part in Christ; God bestowes Christ without any regard to our belief or unbelief:* Which words how high soever against the Gospel, yet he undertakes to salve with a distinction. There is a twofold receiving of Christ, saith he, (1.) *There is a passive receiving of Christ, You will say,* (saith my Authour) *what is passive receiving of Christ? I answer,* (saith he) *A passive receiving of Christ, is just such a receiving of him, as when a froward Patient takes a purge, or some bitter physick, he shuts his teeth against it; but the Physician forceth his mouth open, and poures it downe his throat, and so it works against his will, by the over-ruling power of one over him, that knows it is good for him: Thus I say, there is a passive recipiency or receiving of Christ, which is the first receiving of him; when Christ comes by the gift of the Father, to a person whileſt he is in the stubbornesse of his own heart. (2.) There is an active receiving of him, &c.*

This distinction carries a full contradiction in it self, There cannot be in the same subject, a meere passive and active recipiency of the same thing, as appeares in the similitude brought to illustrate it; This froward Patient that hath a medicine forced into him, in which he is meerly passive, cannot again afterwar dreceive that medicine. If Christ be thus forced, and enters against our will, then we cannot actively at any time after receive him, And could it be reconciled unto it self, yet it stands in full opposition to Scripture; Christ stands at the door and knocks, *Rev.* 3.20. He waites till his locks are wet with the dew of the night, as *Cant.* 5 2.

But

But he makes no forcible entry; we read of Gods power in changing the will that it freely accepts, but not forcing gifts of grace upon any against their wills: *Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power*, Pſal. 110.3. *He works a will*, Philip. 2.13. Chriſt dwells in none that riſe in hoſtility againſt him, and the poſition, which the diſtinction is brought to aſſert, (*That unbelief is no bar hindring one from having Chriſt*) is no better; if unbeliefe be no barre to our receiving of Chriſt; then it is no barre to ſalvation; where the Saviour enters, he brings ſalvation, *He that hath the Son, hath life*, 1 John 5 12. But we finde it evidently a barre to ſalvation, according to Scripture, *Joh.* 3.36. *He that beleeveth not the Sonne, ſhall not ſee life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. He that beleeveth not, ſhall be damned*, Mark 16. 16. Yea, according to the Author himſelf, *There is no perſon under heaven ſhall be ſaved* (ſaith he) *till he have beleeved*; which is a truth according to Scripture. They could not enter into the reſt of *Canaan*, that did lie in their unbelief, Neither can they enter into the reſt of heaven, *Heb.* 4.1. Then *Chriſt dwells not in our hearts by Faith*, Epheſ. 3.17. But alſo in a ſtate of unbelief; Then God is not a juſtifier *of thoſe that beleeve in Jeſus*, as *Rom.* 3.26. but equally juſtifies men without Faith in Jeſus; Then Chriſt is not ſet out *a propitiation through Faith in his blood*, but without any Faith in it; Then they that beleeve are not only juſtified *from all things from which they could not be juſtified by the Law of Moſes*, but they that beleeve not. And God gave his Sonne, that he that beleeves not *on him ſhould have everlaſting life*. This doctrine layes all the honour of Faith in the duſt; Then *Habakkuk* might have ſpared this ſpeech, *that the juſt ſhall live by Faith*, Habbakuk 2. 4. and *Paul* might have found another way of life in the fleſh than *by Faith in the Son of God*.

Secondly, It is ſaid that the juſtification of a ſinner was with God from eternity; It was in his purpoſe before all time to diſcharge his Elect, and to lay nothing to their charge; So then this is, as election it ſelfe, unconditional. *Object.*

To which I anſwer, That this overthrows the redemption wrought by Chriſt, and the price paid by his ſufferings, as well as the neceſſity of Faith; What need Chriſt to be at all that pains, to *Anſw.*

undergo all those sorrows, as to be *a man of sorrows*, to do that which from all eternity was done? Then, as *Paul* sayes in another case, *Christ is dead in vain*: This some have seene, yet rather than leave their opinion, have chosen to swallow it down, and the absurdity with it, and do maintaine that Christ did not purchase, procure, or work any love from God for man, but only published and declared that he was from eternity beloved; A fit conclusion drawn from such premisses: Then Christ was no Authour of eternal salvation, as *Heb.* 5 9. but only the publisher, He was a messenger from God, in the dayes of his flesh, but no Saviour of man; He did not redeeme us with a price, but only made known that we were so farre in the love of God from eternity that no redemption needs. Secondly, I say, Gods purpose of a thing doth no put it in being; He takes his own way, to bring about in time, that which he purposed before all time; All that is done, even every work under the Sunne, was alike from eternity in the purpose of God, *Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world*, Acts 15. 18. So the house that was built this day, was built from eternity; The childe that was born this day, was borne from eternity; We may as well say that the Elect were glorified from eternity, so that they need to look after no other glorification, as to say they are justified from eternity. All the works of God were in his purpose from ever, who sees all things at once; and not as we can comprehend them in their respective succession? But we enquire after things as they are in themselves and not as they are in Gods purpose.

Object. Thirdly, Some say justification can be no other, than an act of God from eternity, being an immanent act, and not a transient. Transient acts are in time done, in the juncture of time when God pleases to do them, but immanent acts of God are from eternity.

Answ. To which I first answer, that it is not without danger for us to bring the actions of God under our examination, and then to fix School-notions upon them, according to which they must be bounded, When (as Master *Burges* well observes) *we are here in meere darknesse, and not able to comprehend how God is said to act or work.* Treatise of Justification, *page* 166. How much more safe were it for us to learne *à posteriore*, from the mouth of God in Scriptures, what his actions are, and the order how he works, than *à priore*, to conclude that they are thus and thus,

thus, and therefore thus of neceſſity he muſt work? Yet if we may be ſo bold as to look into this act of his, and take it into conſideration, according to this notion; we may farre rather conclude that juſtification is an action tranſient, not immanent. *An immanent action* (as the Schooles tell us) *is terminated within the ſubject, and works no real nor evident change out of it:* and they inſtance in our conceptions of, and reſolutions about things, *Kekerman*, p. 107. *A tranſient act is not terminated within the ſubject, but hath its effect, and is terminated upon ſome other object.* Now, if by way of analogy we may apply theſe to God, for we otherwiſe can reach none of his actions; it is eaſie to conclude that juſtification of a ſinner is a tranſient, and no immanent act; It works man from a ſtate of wrath to a ſtate of friendſhip and love, of a veſſel of wrath, brings man into favour and eſteeme, which though it work no Phyſical change in man, yet the whole effect is terminated in him; That act of *Pharaoh*, had as real an effect upon *Joſeph*, and was terminated in him in his advancement out of priſon, for rule in *Egypt*, as though a Phyſician in caſe of ſickneſſe, had wrought a cure upon him. Though I were not able to hold it out, that juſtification were a tranſient act, but according to our conception of the actions of man, it ſhould rather appear to be an action immanent in God, ſo in him that it had no effect out of him, yet I muſt follow the Scriptures that make juſtification an act in time, not from eternity. *Paul* having mentioned a ſtate of ſinne under which the *Corinthians* were, ſaith, *ſuch were ſome of you, but ye are waſhed, but ye are ſanctified, but ye are juſtified*, 1 Corinth. 6. 11. Once they were not, but now they are in a ſtate of juſtification; It hath its τὸ νῦν, in which it is acted, a ſeaſon in which it is vouchſafed. It is affixed to faith. *Acts* 13 38. Now faith is not from eternity, it comes by hearing; A Miniſtery is continually employed for reconciliation and pardon of ſinne, 1 *Cor.* 5. 19. *John* 20. Which were in vain if juſtification were as election, *from before the foundation of the world*; They work them not to election, but only call upon them *to make their calling and election ſure*; There are ſeniors and juniors in this priviledge, one obtains it before another; *Andronicus and Junia were in Chriſt before the Apoſtle*, Rom. 16. 7. Theſe evident proofs would take with my faith, above a thouſand ſuch ſubtilties. But herein the Schools, in their application of

Quæ realem & evidentem mutationem extriuſecus nullam inſert. Tranſiens actio eſt quæ revera mutationem inſert.

theſe acts to God, ſpeak according (as to the point in hand) to the minde of Scriptures.

Object. Fourthly, It is farther objected that *Chriſt is the Lamb ſlaine from the beginning of the world.* His death hath been of efficacy in the Church through all ages, *And he bore our ſinnes in his body,* 1 Pet. 2. 24. *All our ſinnes did meet in him,* Iſa. 53.6. and therefore from the beginning we were juſtified.

Anſw. I anſwer, it profited all thoſe, and only thoſe in each age to whom it was revealed, and by whom it was applied, and not thoſe that have no intereſt in him. Over and above the Decree of God for mans ſalvation, there was a neceſſity of the death of Chriſt for our redemption, which Chriſt in the fulneſſe of time paid on the Croſſe. And over and above the death of Chriſt, there is a like neceſſity of the application of it to our ſoules for life; The work of redemption was finiſhed on the Croſſe, when Chriſt *triumphed over principalities and powers.* But much of the work of our ſalvation was behinde; Election did not overthrow Chriſts redemption, but did eſtabliſh it; Redemption doth not overthrow our application, but doth eſtabliſh it likewiſe. There is a farther work of Chriſts to be done, his interceſſion in heaven being one part of his Prieſt-hood, which he is gone to diſcharge as the High Prieſt into the holieſt of holies; A farther work to be done by man through believing. Not to have intereſt in Chriſts death, is all one as though he had not died; He that beleeves in him ſhall not periſh. See *Baxter of Juſtification, Aphoriſme* 15. *Davenant de morte Chriſti, cap.* 5. *p.* 58, *&c.*

Object. Laſtly, it is ſaid by another, *If Faith be a condition of the Covenant of Grace, then it can be no inſtrument of our juſtification; If it be a condition in this Covenant, it juſtifies as a condition, and then it cannot juſtifie as an inſtrument, and ſo I pul down what I build, and run upon contradictions.*

Anſw. I anſwer, I ſhould rather judge on the contrary, that becauſe it is a condition of the covenant, in the way as it is before expreſt, that it is therefore an inſtrument in our juſtification; God tenders the gift of righteouſneſſe to be received by Faith. He covenants for this Faith, for acceptation of this righteouſneſſe. By beleeving then we keep covenant, and receive Chriſt for juſtification, We as well do what God requires, as receive what he tenders; We do our duty, and take Gods gift, and thereby keep covenant,

and

and receive life, and so Faith is both a condition and an instrument.

A justified man is fitted for every duty, to which God is pleased for to call.

Here I might by way of just corollary infer, that a justified man reconciled to God in Christ, is a man fitted for every duty unto which God calls, which he is pleased to require; Faith is his justification, the instrumental work of his reconciliation to God; and all things are possible to him that beleeveth, *Mark* 9. 23. There is not a duty commanded, but a beleeving man through Christ is strengthned for it; *The Word works effectually in those that believe*, as 1 *Thes.* 2. 13. We see the great works that were atchieved by those of ancient time, both in doing and suffering, *Heb.* 11. and all of those are ascribed to Faith, what Christ can do as in reference to duty, that they can do to acceptation; *They can do all things through Christ that strengthens them*, Phil. 4. 13. Christ *overcomes the world*, John 16 33. *And this is their victory whereby they overcome the world*, 1 John 5. 4. *Christ treads down Satan*, Rom. 16 20. *And they resist him strong in the Faith*, 1 Pet. 5. 9. A man of Faith is for universal obedience; He is a man for dependance on God for the fruition of all promises. A word from God is enough for Faith. He knows how to rest upon him, for the good things of the earth, he is above anxious thoughts, *what he should eate, what he should drink, or wherewith he should be clothed*, knowing that *godlinesse hath the promise of this life*, 1 Tim. 4 8 and therefore, *Though the fig-tree shall not blossome, neither shall fruit be in the Vines, the labour of the Olive shall faile, and the fields shall yeeld no meat, the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no heard in the stalls, yet he will rejoyce in the Lord, he will joy in the God of his salvation*, Hab 3. 17, 18. he knows how to rest upon him for spiritual priviledges, for adoption of sonnes, for everlasting salvation; He rests upon this, that *he that liveth and beleeveth in Christ shall not die for ever*. He knows how to manage all states and conditions, he *knows how to be full, and how to be hungry*; he can beare prosperity, and not be puffed up; He can be under adversity, and not be cast down; In the worst of times, the just lives by faith, *Hab.* 2. 4. He can make use of every Ordinance for his spiritual advantage. The word preacht is for his benefit, *Being mixt with faith when he receives it*, Heb. 4 2. He knows how to improve the Sacraments for his spiritual growth, those *seales of the righteousnesse of*

Faith

Faith, Rom. 4. 11. *Abel* by Faith exceeded *Cain* in ſacrifices, *Heb.* 11. 4. and ſo do theſe exceed all unbeleevers in their performances. All of theſe might be farther and more fully enlarged, but that it is done at large by better hands; Maſter *Ward* in his Life of Faith, Maſter *Culverwel*, eſpecially Maſter *Ball* in his elaborate treatiſe on that ſubject.

CHAP. XXIII.

Repentance is a condition of the Covenant of grace.

THe condition immediately ſerviceable for mans reconciliation to God, we have ſeen; that which reſpects his reparation in his qualifications, to hold up communion with God, follows, which is, Repentance. The end of Chriſts coming in the fleſh being to ſave ſinners: He ſaves them not in their ſins; but from their ſins; and therefore calls them to repentance, and engages all to it, that he receives into covenant. As God will have a ſelf-outed, and beleeving people, So, he will have an humble and an holy people. So *John Baptiſt* the forerunner of the Mediatour, began his Miniſtery, *Repent*, giving in this, as his reaſon, *The Kingdome of heaven is at hand*, that is, a New Teſtament-ſtate, in which the covenant of Grace was to be opened, and the glorious priviledges of it made manifeſt, *Matth.* 3. 2. With the ſelf-ſame words, Jeſus, the Mediatour of the covenant, begins his Miniſtery, *Matth.* 4. 12, 17. *verſes* compared. *From that time Jeſus began to preach, and to ſay, Repent, for the Kingdome of Heaven is at hand.* To this he reſolves to engage thoſe that he receives. So it was with the twelve, that were men employed to bring Nations into covenant. They thus began their Miniſtery, *Mark* 6. 12. *They went out, and preached that men ſhould repent.* Neither let any make theſe two (Faith and Repentance, or Faith and Obedience, which is compriſed under Repentance) one and the ſame, an old project to introduce juſtification by works. The Scriptures evidently diſtinguiſh them, *Paul* makes them two diſtinct heads in the Miniſtery, when he preached either to the Jews or Gentiles, *Acts* 20. 21. *Teſtifying*

Faith and Repentance are diſtinct graces, and not one and the ſame.

ing both to the Jews, and alſo to the Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. They are two diſtinct heads, of Catechiſme in the Apoſtles times, *Repentance from dead works, and Faith towards God*, Heb. 6. *Repent ye, and beleeve the Goſpel*, Mark 1.15. There are thoſe acts in Scripture attributed to Faith, that will by no means be aſcribed to love or obedience, as the taking in of the priviledges before mentioned. If *Faith work by love*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *Gal.* 5.6. *And love be the end of the commandment, out of a pure heart, and of a good conſcience, and faith unfeigned*, 1 Tim. 1.5. Then faith is a diſtinct thing from love. If by Faith the Worthies of old *wrought righteouſneſſe*, then righteouſneſſe may be diſtinguiſhed from it, *Heb.* 11. 33. As Faith and Hope make two Graces, ſo Love a third, 1 *Cor.* 13.13. It is not the Goſpel way to confound them together, They muſt not be divided, but they are to be diſtinguiſhed. In this of repentance which is a Goſpel-grace and condition of the covenant, we may

obſerve { First, A neceſſary pre-requiſite to it.
Secondly, The eſſential parts of it.

A neceſſary pre-requiſite to this of repentance (as to the other of Faith) is Conviction, Compunction, Remorſe, Unto which the name of repentance is often given, though it be of farre more narrow comprehenſion than the whole work; yea, it reacheth not unto any thing which is of the eſſence of it, Called repentance (as ſome ſay) by a *Synechdoche*, the part for the whole; but I rather take it to be a *Metonimy*; Sorrow is rather an adjunct than a part of it, yet ſuch an adjunct that ſtill accompanies it, and makes way for it, as the needle (as the Ancients uſe to expreſſe it) enters the cloth, not to ſtay, but to let in the thread. An Officer enters an houſe, to throw out one inhabitant, and to let in another, but not to ſtay himſelf. It hath its name from paine, grief, or trouble, which affects the ſoul for ſin, which muſt needs follow, when once we look uponit with ſhame and wearisomneſſe. Who can imagine a man to have his eyes opened, to ſee that through his whole life, he hath riſen up in hoſtility, and oppoſition againſt God? hath taken off that ſtamp, which God in creation put upon him? run his ſoul upon everlaſting hazard, and all of this without ſenſe of ſhame, fear, or trouble? Who can imagine

Godly ſorrow is a prerequiſite to repentance.

Some degree of soul-shaking by the Law necessary.

gine that the soul can leave so ugly a path, as that of sin formerly so pleasant, and desired, without any grief or trouble of minde that he hath so long held it? Or that any will make out for help in a Saviour, till they see themselves through sinne in a lost and undone condition? I speak not of infants (who neither act faith nor repentance) but of those of growth, whom God works for himself by his Ministers, As they have their call by the Word, So the Word hath its efficacy in some measure of soul-shaking, by the Lawes discovery, by *which is the knowledge of sinne*, as *Rom.* 3.20. Evangelical allurements (on which by some the whole of the work is laid) can never (I suppose) work on the soule without Law-convictions. If these Gospel allurements draw to Christ, they must draw from sinne, and how shall any be drawn from what he does not know; nor ever understood either to be evil, or dangerous? It is with me no lesse a Paradox, that a man may be drawn from sin, without the discovery of the Law, as to be drawn to Christ without the light of the Gospel, And to say the Gospel discovers sin, as well as the Law; taking the Gospel in opposition to the moral precepts, (as here it must be taken) is the greatest absurdity. *Exem. gr.* If it be questioned whether to take up armes be a sin? whether to fight a duel be a sinne? whether usury be sin? or to marry within the Levitical degrees forbidden be sin, shall I determine this out of a Gospel-promise? *That Jesus Christ came to save sinners. That the blood of Christ takes away all sin. That in him all that beleeve are justified.* A thousand of these will contribute nothing to the expediting of these or like questions; or the conviction of any under guilt; The work must be brought to the rule, the action to the line for discovery; Upon the Laws convictions there may follow Gospel-aggravations; But conviction is the work of the Law, as an instrument of the Spirit. This conviction unto change is hardly without compunction, remorse, and terrours in the soul. It was not the single case of the Corinthians, but common with other Christians, as the natural work of godly sorrow, *that it worketh repentance not to be repented of*, 2 Cor. 7. 10. I will not stand to dispute whether any ever are exempted from this preparatory work. I question not Gods prerogative, I am upon enquiry after his usual method. I know some instance in *Matthew*, who being called, suddenly, followed Christ, and we heare nothing of any work upon

upon his ſpirit to trouble; But who knows whether *Matthew*, a Jew, were not called by grace, before this call to an Apoſtleſhip? and if not in grace, whether it neceſſarily followed in that inſtant? The like is objected of *Lydia*, *The Lord opened her heart, that ſhe attended to the things that were ſpoken of* Paul, *Acts* 16. 14. without any ſorrow or trouble in ſpirit is mentioned; Neither is there mention of any joy, or rejoycing in ſpirit, and ſhe by many is believed alſo to have been a Proſelyte. Yet this of godly ſorrow, muſt be underſtood with ſome limit.

Limits put to this doctrine of godly ſorrow.

1. An equal degree of ſorrow, and preparative work, is not neceſſary in all; One mans terrours and heart-breakings, are no neceſſary precedent, for all others to reach.

2. An high degree is not neceſſarily required of any; God can come ſooner in, with Goſpel-cordials, after Law-convictions, unto one than another.

3. No man hath reaſon to quarrel his converſion; becauſe his ſorrow hath not been like ſome others; each man hath not like paine in cure of a like malady.

4. None ſhould beg of God overwhelming and amazing ſhakings; and humiliations of Spirit, God better knows their frame than they underſtand themſelves.

5. None can judge of the truth of their repentance by the greatneſſe of their trouble; It may poſſibly end in horrour and work nothing better than it ſelf; It may only have its preſent work to caſt hell in the face, and then the perſon returne to his old byaſſe, to his ſinful pleaſures, his worldly advantages, as *Saul* to his Muſick, *Cain* to his building of Cities; yet when God thus plowes, it is a hopeful ſigne he intends ſowing, and men in this caſe muſt not reaſon themſelves to be ſuch ſoyle, on whom no good can be done, as though they were paſt all husbandry of the Lord, He can take away a heart of ſtone, and turne a rock into a fruitful field. This is Gods method, do not diſpute, but believe.

6. Then it is in a degree ſufficient, when it effects the work for which it ſerves; when it brings the ſoul out of love with ſin, takes it out of the paths of ſinne, when it ſo works to an apprehenſion of dangers, that it works the ſoul to caſt it ſelf on Chriſt Jeſus. When horrours work deſires; not of eaſe, but of grace, of Chriſt and of whole Chriſt, of pardon of ſin, and power againſt ſin, there is a true work.

The essentials in repentance are,
1. Privative Cessation from sinne.

For the essential parts of this grace, which I make a Gospel-engagement and condition of the covenant, they are privative, or positive. Privative, is the destruction of what hath been. Positive is the introduction of what is not. Every change hath two termes. The one is *terminus ad quem*; which is endeavoured. The other is *terminus à quo*, which is left; and so in this change which grace works, and to which the covenant of grace doth engage. The privative part which we are to leave, is, sin, the work of Satan. The positive part which we are to endeavour, is that which stands in full opposition; Forsaking of sin, we must follow after righteousnesse, and turning from Satan, we must turne to God; and therefore the Ministery which findes men out of covenant, and works them into it, is to bring them from darknesse to light, from the power of Satan to God, *Acts* 26. 18. The privative part is frequently enjoyned, as that which bindes at all times, and to all times. A man in covenant with God, is to have no more to do with sin; *Cease to do evil, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes*, Isa. 1. 16. *Be ye separate, touch no unclean thing*, 2Cor. 6. 17. *Mortifie therefore your members which are upon the earth, fornication, uncleanesse, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousnesse, which is idolatry; for which things sake, the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience. In the which ye also walked sometimes when ye lived in them, But now you also put off all these, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth; lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds*, Col. 3. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. Old things with Christians are to be done away; This is the duty of all those that pretend to Christ; *Let every one that nameth the Name of Christ depart from iniquity*, 2Tim. 2. 19. All that is in Christ, is wholly against it; His Prophetick office leads us from it, and gives us light to avoid it; In his Kingly office, his Law is against it; and his Priestly office is to redeem from it. They that are in Christ, and learn him as the truth is in Christ Jesus, attaine to it, *Ephes.* 4. 22. That ye put off *concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.* It is the character of a man in Christ, *Gal.* 5. 24. *They that are Christs, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.* And this upon peril of bearing their sinne, *Ezek.* 18. 30, 31. *Repent and turne your selves from all your transgressions,*

so

so iniquity shall not be your ruine: Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby you have transgressed, and make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? No man in sinne is for glory, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9. *Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleannesse, lasciviousnesse, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, varience, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkennesse, revellings and such like, of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the Kingdome of God,* Gal. 5. 19, 20, 21. Upon these termes it is that they obtaine pardon of sinne, *Isa.* 55. 7. *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him returne unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.* Grace is no where more freely tendred than there: *Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money, and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which satisfieth not; hearken diligently unto me, and eat you that which is good, and let your soul delight it self in fatnesse. Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting Covenant with you, even the sure mercies of* David, *verse* 1, 2, 3. And yet we see upon what termes it is tendered. That which keeps from us the mercies, and brings upon us the curses of the covenant, is upon covenant-condition, to be shunned; This is true of all covenants made where any good is hoped, and evil feared. That sinne against God keeps us from the mercies, and brings upon us the curses of the covenant, is clear in what hath been spoke: *What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldst take my covenant in thy mouth, seeing thou hast instruction, and castest my words behinde thee?* Psal. 50. 16, 17. A people that keep to their termes of covenant, are in communion with God; but sinne separates between a people and God; that is the ground of quarrel, *Hos.* 4. 1. between earth, and heaven. Men entring and keeping covenant with God, are of God, and not of the Devil; They are turned from the Devil to God, from fellowship with *Belial*, to fellowship with God; *But he that committeth sin, is of the Devil,* 1 John 3. 8. Christ that carries on the covenant

(as you have heard) will never caſt off thoſe that walk up to the termes of the covenant; but he caſts off, with a dreadful ſentence all thoſe that work iniquity, *Mat.* 7. 23. As for thoſe Antinomian ſpirits, and ranting wretches, that do contend that ſinne is no barre to their communion with God; *That God is as well pleaſed with man in the greateſt heighth of ſinne, as the moſt holy duties; That this doctrine charges a change upon God, to be now pleaſed, and preſently in wrath and diſpleaſure;* they do but deceive themſelves, and make it their work to deceive others. They neither know ſin, nor the direful guilt of it, nor yet God, nor his direful diſpleaſure againſt it. The Apoſtle makes it his buſineſſe to undeceive them, as *Epheſ.* 5. 6. having reckoned up a catalogue of ſins, he thus ſpeaks; *Be not deceived with vaine words, for becauſe of theſe things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of diſobedience.* Neither is there any change (according to this doctrine) ſuppoſed in God. The change is in them that covenant againſt it, and walk in it. Did they know the terrour of it, they would tremble at the thought of running upon it, and by heaping up ſin *to treaſure up wrath againſt the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgements of God,* Rom. 2. 5. They will finde this an aggregate of all miſeries, and let them take heed that they call not to the rocks and mountains to hide them from it.

2. Poſitive. A returne to God, and an holy walking with him.

The Poſitive part is to be followed, as the Privative part to be ſhunned. As *Timothy* muſt *flee covetouſneſſe*, ſo he muſt *follow after righteouſneſſe, godlineſſe, faith, love, patience, meekneſſe,* 1 Tim. 6. 11. Faith in the former place as an inſtrument ſerviceable for our acceſſe to God, makes up (as we heard) a condition of it ſelf, As a work or inherent grace, it is here compriſed in this covenant-condition, together with others, to hold up our communion with God. *As we muſt ceaſe to do evil, ſo we muſt learne to do well; As we muſt put off the old man with his deeds, ſo we muſt put on the new man.* It is not enough, not to bring evil fruit, wilde grapes; but we muſt be *fruitful in every good work.* God hath a quarrel with his people upon a charge of negatives, as well as affirmatives, omiſſions, as well as commiſſions. *She obeyed not the voice, ſhe received not correction, ſhe truſted not in the Lord, ſhe drew not neer to her God,* Zeph. 3. 2. We muſt not alone, be free, from that charge of Chriſt upon the Jews, *of doing the work of the Devil,* John 8. 44. but we *muſt abound in the work of the Lord,*

Lord, 1 Cor. 15.58. And this upon the penalty mentioned in the former branch; *Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, shall be hewen down and cast into the fire*, Matth. 3.10. Upon these termes it is, that we avoid the curse of the covenant. Those on whom no condemnation is charged, *walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; and the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentlenesse, goodnesse, faith, meekenesse, temperance*, Gal. 5.21,22. Upon those termes, salvation, the mercy of the covenant is obtained, *Christ is the Authour of everlasting salvation to them that obey him*, Heb. 5.9. When the Apostle makes light of outward priviledges, he puts the whole stresse upon mans faith and obedience, Gal. 5.6. *For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the Commandments of God*, 1 Cor. 7.19. That which is so mightily available with God in covenant, is the walking up to the terms and observance of the conditions of the covenant; But faith and the keeping of the Commandments of God, are as we see) thus available and prevalent. These two are distinguished, but never severed. That faith which looks at Christs blood as a Saviour, accepts him as a Sovereign, and the latter about which there is most dispute, is an evidence to conclude the former; *Hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his Commandments*, where knowledge is put for faith, as appears in the context, 1 *Joh.* 2.3. These are heard of God in prayer, *Joh.* 9.32. *If any man be a worshipper of God, and doth his will, him he heareth. Whatsoever we aske, we receive of him, because we keep his Commandment, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight*, 1 John 3.22. These are sealed of God by his Spirit, 1 *John* 3.24. *And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.* These great mercies are for men in covenant, that keep covenant: *But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousnesse unto childrens children. To such as keep his Covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them*, Ps. 103.17,18.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

Objections against the conditionality of Repentance answered.

Object. HEre Objections must be removed; First, joyntly against faith and repentance, some making challenge of both as no covenant-conditions. So Mr. *Baxters* queſtioniſt, *How do you make faith and repentance, to be conditions of the Covenant on our part, ſeeing the beſtowing of them, is part of the condition on Gods part; can they be our conditions and Gods too?*

The Objection retorted. *Anſw.* In caſe theſe two cannot ſtand together, that they ſhould be conditions both Gods and ours; we may anſwer by way of retortion, and I am ſure we have the better end of the ſtaffe, that they are our conditions; They are conditions on our part, and therefore they cannot be Gods: That they are ours, is made known of God, as by the beame of the Sun in his Word. And I ſhall not ſtand to diſtinguiſh of an abſolute and conditional covenant, that ſo making the whole in the abſolute covenant to be Gods, and in the conditional covenant, this part to be ours, which I know not whether exactly underſtood, the Scripture will beare, but in plaine terms deny that they are Gods conditions, and affirm them to be ours. I know what God ſpeaks in his Word concerning theſe works; *That he will write his Law in our hearts, and put it into our inward parts; That he will take away the heart of ſtone, and give an heart of fleſh*; which implies this work of which we ſpeak. I know likewiſe what in particular is affirmed of Chriſt, that *he is the authour and finiſher of our faith*, Heb. 12.2. *that he gives repentance*, Acts 5.31. *that God grants to the Gentiles repentance to life*, Acts 11.18. And I have not forgot what I have ſaid before of the concurrence of grace in the performance of every Goſpel-work; Yet all this riſes not up hither to make them formally Gods act, & not ours. Whoſe acts they be, his conditions they are; this is evident: But they are our acts, We beleeve, We repent, It is not God that believes; It is not God that repents: That is an abſurdity which *Arminians* have laboured to charge upon us, to render that which we hold of the neceſſity of the concurrence of grace in theſe works odious; But it is that which the Orthodox party have ſtill diſclaimed. The Apoſtle calls upon the *Philippians*, Phil. 2. 12. *To work out their own ſal-*

Faith and repentance are our conditions, not Gods.

vation

vation; the work is their own, as the ſalvation. They are a Beleevers own act, and not barely a ſpontaneous act, (on which he is carried, as a Bird in preparing a neſt for her young, and Bees in preparing honey for their ſubſiſtence, in which Philoſophy tells us, that they aime at no end) but they are voluntary actions of choice, done out of choice, aiming at ſalvation as his end. The mercy in the Covenant being on theſe termes tendred, *With the heart man beleeveth unto righteouſneſſe*, Rom. 10. 10. *The juſt lives by his faith*, Hab. 2. 4. *They to turne to the Lord with all their heart*, Joel 2. 13. *They obey from the heart the form of Doctrine whereunto they are delivered*, Rom. 6. 17. *They do the will of God from the heart*, Epheſ. 6. 6. Faith and Repentance are mans work, which man in covenant does, reſpective to ſalvation in the covenant tendered, not Gods. But the Apoſtle, ſome may ſay, in the next words tells us, *that it is God that works the will and the deed*, verſ. 13. There he ſeems to take them from us, and aſcribe the formality of them to God. In this co-operation of God, whether they be formally our works, or Gods, let *Eſay* determine, *Iſa.* 26. 12. *Thou haſt wrought all our works in us*; When God hath wrought it, the work is ours, we have the reward of it, and we ſhall beare our ſinne in caſe it be neglected, and let the Apoſtle explaine himſelfe, *Epheſ.* 2. 10. *We are his workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we ſhould walk in them.* God hath ordained good works as a Chriſtians way and walk. They are charged upon man as is plain in the context, in order to ſalvation; They are the way that we hold in our paſſage on to that ſalvation which God of grace vouchſafes; and we are Gods workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus for theſe ends. Our dexterity in holy duties, is from the frame into which grace puts us; So ſtill the work is ours, though power for action is vouchſafed of God, And the conditions are ours, for diſcharge of which we have yet divine aſſiſtance: That faith and repentance are our conditions, and not Gods, take theſe arguments.

Object.

Sol.

Via ad regnum non cauſa regnandi.

N.B.

Arguments evincing that Faith and Repentance are our conditions, and not Gods, in the proper conditional covenant.

1. Thoſe conditions that are not mentioned in the proper conditional covenant, as from God, but required of God, from us, are not Gods conditions, but ours, in that Covenant. This is cleare; Being there expreſly required of us, and not ſo much as mentioned, as from God; they cannot be his engagement, but

ours to performe. But Faith and Repentance are not mentioned as from God, in the proper conditional covenant, but required of God from us. Therefore Faith, and Repentance are not Gods conditions in the proper conditionall Covenant, but ours.

2. The conditions of a covenant are his that performeth, and not his that imposeth. This proposition is cleare in reason, and confessed by the adversary. But we perform, and God imposeth Faith and Repentance. They are therefore our conditions, and not Gods, in this covenant.

3. Covenant-conditions are theirs, that are charg'd with falshood in case of failing in them, and non-performance of them. This is plaine in all covenants: To make conditions, and to faile in them, is to be false to them. But in case of failing in Faith and Repentance, man is charged, and not God. God fails not, but man deals falsly. Therefore, they are mans conditions, and not Gods.

4. Covenant-conditions are theirs, who upon failing in them, and not performance of them, suffer as covenant-breakers. This is clear; *Israel* covenanted to dismisse their Hebrew servants, and dismissed them not, and *Israel* suffered for it, *Jer.* 34. But upon failing in Faith and Repentance, God suffers not, so much as in his Name, as a covenant-breaker. He is not charged with Mens unbelief and impenitence: Men themselves suffer. Therefore Faith and Repentance are mans conditions, not Gods.

Object. In what manner Works are called for in the Covenant of Grace.

2. There are objections peculiarly against repentance, as it comprises the whole frame of obedience, as before held forth to disable it from being any Gospel-condition.

By this means the covenant of Grace will be (say some) *a covenant of works; Repentance in this latitude* (*to which we have spoken*) *containes the whole of obedience, and being made a condition of the Covenant of Grace, Works are introduced, and a Covenant of Works re-established.*

Answ.

As there was grace in the first covenant, as you have heard, which we call a covenant of Works; So works are not wholly excluded from this covenant, which we call a covenant of Grace. God still keeps up his Sovereignty, as you have heard, and how this can be done when he leaves man, at that wilde freedome, not so much as to call for homage from him, cannot be con-

conceived, his rule even in this covenant, is to reward men *according to their works. Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me; to give every man according as his work shall be*, Rev. 22. 12. Works then are not excluded from this covenant; yea, Christ the Mediatour of the covenant aforehand tells us, *Except our righteousnesse exceed the righteousnesse of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdome of heaven*, Matth. 5. 20. They had their righteousnesse, and (as was supposed) they made a great progresse in the way of righteousnesse; yet we must have an exceeding righteousnesse, above that which they taught, and practised, or else there is no salvation in this covenant. These two covenants notwithstanding remaine distinct, and not confounded together. There is a legal righteousnesse; such as the Law in the highest extremity of it requires, whithout the least indulgence in case of failing; This the covenant of Works calls for, and in this we fall short; but Christ answers, and therefore He *is the end of the Law for righteousnesse*, Rom. 10. 3. *and by this*, we are saved. There is a righteousnesse of the Gospel which God in covenant calls for, to which it is his Spirit enables, *and in this* we are saved.

Repentance necessarily flowing from Faith, is not thereby disabled from being a condition in the Covenant of Grace.

2. *Gospel-obedience is called for in the Covenant, but not as any condition of the Covenant; Faith is the alone condition, obedience necessarily flows from it, and follows upon it when once we believe; it need not to be conditioned, or indented for; seeing when we are in Christ by faith, we can then do no other than obey.*

I answer. This position here laid down, *that obedience necessarily follows, and flows from Faith*, is a position indeed maintained by the reformed Churches against *Papists*, *Arminians*, *Socinians*, and other opposites of it, from which position of ours, they inferre as by necessary consequence that all commands, requiring obedience, are then needlesse, and all exhortations, reproofs, motives and promises to no purpose. None either commands or perswades the Heavens to move, the Sunne to give light, the Fire to give heat, or the water to give moisture; That which necessarily works is let alone to work, and to take its course in working. And this Objection (taking away this Gospel-condition on this ground) is of the same stamp; Obedience necessarily flowing from Faith, includes Gospel-commands, exhortations, reproofs, as well as Gospel-conditions. If God need

not, to condition, and engage for obedience, from Beleevers, becauſe they thus neceſſarily obey, then he needs not give commands, or preſſe obedience for the ſame reaſon, when yet the Goſpel is full of exhortations, commands, menaces, promiſes, with application to Beleevers, to men profeſſing Faith, to men in Chriſt by Faith.

For ſatisfaction then of this Popiſh-Arminian objection, we muſt diſtinguiſh of conſequents which neceſſarily flow from their principles. Some are natural, which of themſelves have their effects, as thoſe in the objection mentioned; Here is neither command impoſed, condition required, nor promiſe held forth: They are not in any capacity of acting or working otherwiſe than they do. Others are moral, who work not by way of Phyſical neceſſity, but are kept in their way by the power of grace upholding; which does not exclude, but neceſſarily takes in mans endeavour in the uſe of meanes, to yeeld obedience and to hold on, in all patience and perſeverance. This argument followed home will be of equal force, againſt Faith (as a condition) as, againſt ſincerity; ſeeing Gods Elect ſhall beleeve, as they that beleeve ſhall yeeld obedience. There is a like neceſſity of faith, flowing from election, as there is of obedience, to flow from Faith, as Faith therefore, ſo obedience, either of both in their places are covenant-conditions.

CHAP. XXV.

What degree of obedience the Covenant of grace calls for from Chriſtians.

HEre is ſeaſonably moved, and is not without ſome difficulty anſwered; what degree of obedience, this new covenant calls for from us, that ſo we may endeavor it, and underſtand our ſelves when we have by grace attained to it, that having entred covenant with God, we may not be found of thoſe that have wickedly departed; and dealt falſely in the covenant. In this there are ſeveral opinions, which are to come under examination.

First,

First, some say that it is required of Christians in an exact way, in a full perfection, as, of parts, so of degrees, answering to the perfection of the Law, as written in the heart, and given on Mount *Sinai*; And so required that obedience in a more low degree, will not be accepted, or the mercies promised in the covenant obtained; which doctrine of theirs (rigidly followed) stands *as that two edged sword*, Gen. 3. 24. keeping the way of the tree of Life, and making the way to salvation unpassable. Thus the Councel of *Trent*. [a] *If any man shall say, that by Baptisme, men are obliged to Faith only, and not to the observation of the whole Law, let him be accursed*; which *Chemnitius* in his *Examen* confesses in a qualified sense, might be admitted, seeing persons baptised, owe subjection, but not in the sense, which that Canon holds forth, being an allusion to that of the Apostle, *Gal.* 5. 3. *I testifie again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor of the whole Law*; By which Glosse, Baptisme makes Christ of none effect, as well as Circumcision, as it was taken, in the sense of those false Teachers among the *Galatians*, *viz.* as a leading ceremony of the Law, binding to the observation of the whole. And so also *Bellar. lib.* 1. *de Baptis. cap.* 15. [b] *Baptisme doth not make us debtors to Faith only, but to keep the whole Law*, and there explaines himself, that to deny a man *to be a debtor to keep the whole Law, may be taken two wayes, either so, as that to do things against the Law were no sinne, as though the Law were abrogated.* This he confesses Protestants do not say, and in that, he saith *there is no controversie*, or else so, that *justification or salvation doth not depend on the fulfilling of the Law, but only on the mercy of God by faith applied*, this he makes the Protestants errour, and so brings in justification by the Law, and utterly confounds the covenant of works and grace together, onely I confesse the businesse seemes much mollified by the explanations, that they give of those words, *fulfilling of the Law.* First, curtelling the Law, in taking off, the first *fomes*, and motions of actual sinne, yea even all that goes before consent

Perfection of degrees is not so called for of God in Covenant, that upon failing it, the mercies promised in Covenant are lost.

a *Si quis dixerit, baptizatos per baptismum ipsum solius tantùm debitores fidei fieri, non autem universæ legis Christi servandæ; anathema sit.* Sess. Sept. Canon Sex.

b *Baptismus non id efficit, ut homo solius fidei debitor sit, non autem implendæ universæ legis. Duobus modis intelligi posse hominem baptizatum dici liberum à lege divina servanda; uno modo ut facere contra eam legem non sit injustum nec peccatum, quasi lex abrogata esset; de hoc sensu non est controversia: altero modo intelligi potest ut facere contra legem sit quidem peccatum, tamen non imputetur iis qui fidem habent, nec pendeat justificatio aut salus ab impletione legis, sed à sola misericordia quæ per fidem apprehenditur.*

ſent of will, making it no ſinne at all, as alſo multitudes of actions, ſome of them foule enough, as not within this verge, ſuch, which they call by the name of venial ſinnes, which are beſides the Law, but not againſt it, bending, (as ſome merrily ſpeak) but not breaking the Commandments, though they would never give us a catalogue of ſins, mortal, or venial, nor any certaine mark or character, whereby they might be diſtinguiſhed. All theſe are pared off, as no breaches of the Law, nor (in their own nature) deſerving, the ſentence of eternal death, and the temporal puniſhments due to them after death is holpen out, by their Indulgences. Secondly ſo helping themſelves out with diſtinctions, at leaſt ſome among them, that keeping the Law with them is no other than the grace of ſanctification, in the very ſenſe as the Orthodox hold it forth; He that pleaſes may read what *Janſenius* hath, *chap.* 81. of his Harmony, Oppoſing *Luther* for his denial, *that the firſt and great Commandment in the Law in this life can be fulfilled*; and charging it with blaſphemy, *Luther* having *Auſtins* authority in ſeveral places, (as *Janſenius* confeſſes) for to ſecond him (affirming with him, that this *Commandment in this life cannot be perfected or fulfilled, but it is to be fulfilled in the life to come*, giving his reaſon, [a] *As long as there is any thing of carnal concupiſcence to be reſtrained, God is not with the whole heart loved.*) The good Biſhop knows how by diſtinctions, to ſalve *Auſtin*, and maintaine his doctrine to be good divinity, and denying *Luther* that favour, to leave him under the brand of blaſphemy, ſo that the reſult of all with him, is this, [b] *God is then loved with the whole heart, when any one, out of inward and ſincere affection to God, is principally exerciſed in thoſe things which are of God; ſtudying above all things to pleaſe him, and carefully to obſerve not one, but all his Commandments, and that not ſlothfully, and againſt heart, but diligently, and cheerfully, grieving from the heart if any thing by others or himſelf through infirmity of the fleſh be admitted contrary to the will of God.*

a *Nam cum eſt aliquid carnalis concupiſcentiæ quod vel continendo fœnetur, nam omninò ex tota anima diligitur Deus.*

b *Diligitur tunc Deus ex toto corde; cum quis ex intima & ſincera erga Deum affectione occupatur potiſſimùm in his quæ Dei ſunt, præ omnibus illi placere ſtudens, ac ſollicitus ut non tantum quædam Dei mandata perficiat, ſed cuncta idque non ſeniter & ex triſti animo, ſed gnaviter & hilariter, dolens ex animo ſi quid vel ab alliis vel à ſe per carnis infirmitatem admittatur contrium divinæ voluntati.* Janſenii Harmon. c. 81.

So that ſome might think, all controverſie in this point, may ceaſe; and that the difference between us, were no more than a ſtrife of words, ſeeing we do not only confeſſe that this ought

to

to be done, but also urge a necessity of doing of it, and they say the Law is fulfilled when it is done, But here, 1. Much wrong is done to the Law, as though it were a rule of our strength, not of our duty, that it answered, and might be applied to each mans impaired strength, and weakened abilities, or that the Gospel grace of godly sorrow for sin against the Law, were the keeping of the Law, making repentance a satisfactory discharge, for disobedience; When these men cannot bring up mans nature to the streight line of the Law, they bring down the Law to the crooked nature of man. 2. It is injurious to man, puffing him up with conceit of answering the Law, setting him up as high as he should be laid low, ready to say with the young man in the Gospel, *All these have I kept from my youth*, when holding out the Law in its just latitude, (as it was happily brought home to the Apostles conscience) sin would revive, and he would see himselfe in a lost condition.

The Law a rule of our duty, not of our strength.

A second opinion is, that the covenant of grace requires perfection in the exactest way, without help of these mens distinctions in an equal degree with the covenant of works, but with this difference; In the covenant of works there is no indulgence or dispensation in case of failing, but the penalty takes hold, the curse follows upon it; But the covenant of grace, though it call for perfection, such is the exactnesse of it, yet it accepts of sincerity, such is the qualification of it through grace, or the mercy in it. If I should take up any opinion in the world for the Authours sake, or those that have appeared as Patrons of it, then I should embrace this; The reverence deservedly due to him that (I suppose) first manifted himself in it, hath caused it to finde great entertainment, but upon more than twenty yeares thoughts about it; I finde it labouring under manifold inconveniences.

The Covenant of Grace doth not cal for perfection, and accept sincerity.

1. It establishes the former opinion opposed by Protestants, and but now refuted, as to the obedience and the degree, called for in covenant; And if I should be indulgent to my affections, to cause my judgement to stoop, Dislike of the one, would make me as averse from it, as an opinion of the other would make me prone to receive it. Judgement therefore must lead, and affections be waved.

2. If this opinion stand, then God accepts of Covenant-breakers

breakers, of those that deale falsely in it, whereas Scripture charges it only upon the wicked, upon those of whom God complaines, as rebellious, *Deut.* 29. 25. *Josh.* 7. 15 *Jeremy* 11. 10. *Jeremy* 22. 8, 9. Yea, it may be charged on the best, the most holy in the world lying under the guilt of it, according to this tenent.

3. Then it will follow, that, as none can say, that they have so answered the commands of the Law, that they have never failed, they have not (if put to answer in the greatest rigour) once transgressed, so, neither can they with the Church make appeale to God, *That they have not dealt falsely in the Covenant, nor wickedly departed from their God*, Psal. 44. 17. Every sinne (according to this opinion) being a breach of it, and a dealing falsely in it.

4. Then that great promise of *mercy from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that fear him, and his righteousnesse, unto childrens children to such as keep his Covenant, and to those that remember his Commandments to do them*, Psalme 103. 17, 18. only appertaines to those that so keep the Law, that they sinne not at all against it.

5. Then our Baptism-vow is never to sin against God, and as often as we renew our covenant, we do not only humble our selves that we have sinned, but we afresh binde our selves, never more to admit the least infirmity, and so live and die in the breach of it.

6. Then the distinction between those that entered covenant and broke it, as *Jerem.* 31, 32, 33. and those that have the Law written in their hearts, and put into their inward parts to observe it, falls, all standing equally guilty of the breach of it, no help of grace being of power to enable to keep Covenant. Each of these five last arguments are replyed to, by a distinction of the precept, and conditions of the Covenant. Men that are sincere, break the precept, (as is said) but not the conditions. But I know no precepts in covenants, which are not conditions. Faith and Repentance are Precepts, and I think, the alone Precepts, and I know not, neither do I heare of, any other Conditions.

7. Then it follows that, Sincerity is never called for as a duty, or required as a grace; but only dispensed with as a failing, indulged

dulged as a want. It is not so much a Christians honour or character, as his blemish or failing, rather his defect than praise. But we finde the contrary in *Noah*, *Job*, *Asa*, *Hezekiah*, *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, *Nathaniel*, an Israelite indeed that entered covenant, and kept covenant. Sincerity is a degree towards perfection in obedience, and if the command looks no lower than perfection in degree, the imperfect degree is not commanded, though it be indulged. And therefore I conclude, that, as in the Law, there was pure justice as well in the command given, as the penalty threatened, without any condescension or indulgence. So, in the covenant there is mercy, and condescension, as well in the condition required, as in the acceptance through grace. The Covenant requires no more than it accepts.

Object. The alone Argument, so farre as ever I could learn, that hath brought some of reverend esteeme heretofore into this opinion, is That if the covenant requires not exact perfection, in the same height as the Law calls for it, then a Christian may fall short of the Law in his obedience, and not sin, perfection being not call'd for from him, nor any more called for from him, than through grace he doth performe; he rises as high as his rule, and so sins not through any imperfection, therefore to make it out that a beleevers imperfections are his sins, it must needs be, that the covenant requires perfection, as to make good that he may be saved in his imperfections; it must be maintained that it accepts sincerity.

Sol. But this argument is not of weight, Christ entering a Gospel covenant with man, findes him under the command of the Law, which command, the Law still holds, the Gospel being a confirmation, not a destruction of it. All imperfection then is a sinne upon that account, that it is a transgression of the Law, though (being done against heart, and laboured against) it is no breach of covenant; We are under the Law as men, we are taken into covenant as Christians, Retaining the humane nature, the Law still commands us, though the covenant in Christ, through the abundant grace of it, (upon the termes that it requires and accepts) frees us from the sentence of it.

Here is objected, *What shall we think of those Texts in the New Testament, which require us to be perfect*, 2Cor. 13. 11. James 1. 4. *Yea, perfect as God is perfect*, Matth. 5. 48. *reproving weakneſſe and*

infirmity, and commanding a going on to perfection. Answ. We are to think of them as Protestant Divines, ordinarily do in their commenting upon them; *We deny*, saith *Rivet*, *that the perfection of which Scripture speaks, either when it commands us to be perfect, or gives testimony of perfection, or integrity to some, consists in a freedome from sinne*, Exercit. 52. in *Genes.* pag 267. The Text quoted out of *James*, serves well to explaine the rest, *Let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing*, whence we may argue, 1. That perfection which Christians may attaine, is the perfection that the Apostle calls unto, This is plaine in the text, He calls for perfection, that we may be perfect: But Christians can reach no further a degree in perfection than sincerity; Therefore the Apostle calls onely to sincerity. 2. That is the Apostles meaning, where he speaks of perfection, that himself gives in as his meaning; This is cleare, he is the best interpreter of himself; But he expresses himselfe by *perfect* there to mean *entire*, or *lacking nothing*. A perfection of entirenesse, or integrality then he meanes, a perfection of parts, and not of degrees. For that text of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 13. 11. *Finally brethren, farewell, be perfect, &c.* let us compare with it, that which he testifies of some in *Corinth*, 1 Cor. 2. 6. *Howbeit we speak wisdome among them that are perfect*, that is, those that have a right, and more full understanding of Gospel mysteries, put in opposition to the weaknesse of novices, which perfection is, (according to the Apostle) the way to unity of judgement. As for the Text, *Mat.* 5 48. *Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect*, If it be streined to the highest, it calls for a divine increated perfection, our adversaries then must yeeld, that there is a *sicut similitudinis, non æqualitatis*, in that place. And if the context be consulted, we shall finde, that it is opposed to that half hypocritical-righteousnesse, which was found in Scribes and Pharisees; which all must exceed that enter into the Kingdome of heaven. In *Heb.* 6. 1. a novice-like imperfection in knowledge, is reproved; and a further growth towards perfection is called for; It is further objected, *If perfection were not the duty of a Christian, and unperfectnesse, and infirmity his sinne, why doth the Apostle groane, and grieve under the remainder of his natural infirmities, and presse on to perfection*, Rom. 7. 14. to the 24. *Phil.* 3. 12, 14? The conclusion here is granted;

The

The one is a duty, the other is a ſinne, and becauſe of failing in the one, and the burden of the other, the Apoſtle groanes. Foreſeeing that this would be yeelded him, there is added by way of objection, *Or is ſuch unperfectneſſe a ſinne, onely in reference to the rule of the Law, and not the rule of the Goſpel, or that the Law doth, but the Goſpel doth not call for perfection? Anſw.* There is not one rule of the Law, as I have demonſtrated at large, and another of the Goſpel, ſeeing the Goſpel eſtabliſhes the Law; Onely the Goſpel-covenant, calls for thoſe ſincere deſires, which grace works, to conform us in our meaſure of the rule of the Law. *A3.*

There is yet a third opinion, which I may well doubt whether I underſtand; but ſo farre as I do underſtand, I am as farre from aſſent to it, as, either of the former, and that is of thoſe who do not only aſſert a perſonal inherent righteouſneſſe; as well as imputed againſt the Antinomians; But alſo affirm that this righteouſneſſe is compleat and perfect, which if it were meant onely of the perfection of the ſubject; as oppoſed to hypocriſie, diſſimulation, or doubleneſſe, implying that they do not only pretend for God; but are really for him, that they do not turne to him feignedly (as *Iſrael* was ſometimes charged, *Jerem.* 3. 10.) but with an upright heart, or of the perfection, or entireneſſe of the object, reſpecting not one, or only ſome, but all commandments, which is called a perfection of parts, we might readily aſſent to it. The covenant calls for ſuch perfection, *Gen.* 17. 1. *Walk before me, and be thou perfect*, and many have their witneſſe in Scripture, that they have attained to it, as *Noah*, Gen. 7. 9. *Job*, Job 1. 1. *Hezekiah*, Eſay 38. 3. But a perfection above theſe is maintained; a perfection compleat and full, *Righteouſneſſe ſignifies* (as is ſaid) *a conformity to the Rule, and a conformity with a* quatenus, *or an imperfect rectitude, is not a true conformity or rectitude at all: imperfect righteouſneſſe is not righteouſneſſe, but unrighteouſneſſe. It is a contradiction in adjecto*, though holineſſe be acknowledged to be imperfect *in all reſpects, where perfection is expected, in reference to the degree that it ſhould obtaine, or the degree which it ſhall obtaine, or in reference to the excellent object, about which it is exerciſed, or in reference to the old covenant, or the directive, and in ſome ſenſe the preceptive part of the new Covenant*, in all theſe reſpects it is imperfect, *and righteouſneſſe materially conſidered is holineſſe, and therefore thus imper-*

Our Evangelical righteouſneſſe is imperfect.

fect, but formally considered, it is p rfect righteousneſſe, or none, this not in relation to the old rule, but the new Covenant; Upon this account, they are charged to diſcover groſſe ignorance, that uſe and underſtand the word righteous, and righteouſneſſe, as they relate to the old rule, as if the godly were called righteous (beſides their imputed righteouſneſſe) only becauſe their ſanctification and good works have ſome imperfect agreement with the Law of Works; This, and much more to aſſert, a perſonal perfect inherent righteouſneſſe, as is ſaid; all which as it is here held out to me, is new, and I muſt confeſſe my ſelf in ignorance all over; I never took imperfect righteouſneſſe to imply any ſuch contradiction, no more than imperfect holineſſe. *Iſaiah*, I am ſure, ſaith, *All our righteouſneſſe are as filthy rags*, Eſay 64.6. No greater charge of imperfection can lie againſt the moſt imperfect holineſſe, than the Prophet lays upon our righteouſneſſe. Neither do I underſtand, how holineſſe ſhould be imperfect, taken materially, and righteouſneſſe perfect, taken formally in reference to a rule. We may (for ought I know) as well make holineſſe formal, and refer it to a rule, and righteouſneſſe material, in an abſolute conſideration, without reference to any rule at all. And in ſuch conſideration I do not know how there can be perfection or imperfection either in holineſſe or righteouſneſſe; it is as they come up to, or fall ſhort of the rule that they have, the denomination of perfection or imperfection. *Pauls* Goſpel-frame, whether you will call it righteouſneſſe, or holineſſe, is ſet out, *Rom.* 7. full of imperfection, yet all this, as in reference to the rule, as it anſwered or fell ſhort in conformity to it, *verſe* 22. *I delight in the Law of God after the inward man.* And whereas a charge of ignorance, is laid even upon learned Teachers, that commonly underſtand the word righteouſneſſe, and righteous as it referres to the old rule, I profeſſe my ſelf to have little of their learning, but I am wholly theirs in this ignorance. I know no other rule but the old rule, the rule of the Moral Law that is with me, a rule, a perfect rule, and the only rule. The perfection of this holineſs and righteouſneſs in mans integrity, ſtood in the perfect conformity to this Law, and the reparation of this in our regenerate eſtate (in which the Apoſtle places the image of God) muſt have reference as to God for a patterne, ſo to his Law as a rule. As an image carrying an imperfect reſemblance of its ſamplar,

samplar, is an image, So conformity imperfectly answering the rule is conformity likewise. A perfection of sufficiency to attaine the end I willingly grant, God condescending through rich grace to crown weak obedience, in this sense our imperfection hath its perfectnesse; otherwise I must say that our inherent righteousnesse is an imperfect righteousnesse, in an imperfect conformity to the rule of righteousnesse, and without this reference to the rule there is neither perfection nor imperfection in any action. See Doctor *Davenant* disputing against justification by inherent righteousnesse upon the account of the imperfection of it *de justitia habituali*, pag. 349 and how fully he was perswaded of the imperfection of this righteousnesse appears in sentences prefixt before two Treatises as may be seen in the margent.

Omnis humana justitia injustitia esse deprehenditur, si divinitus districtè judicetur. Gregor. Moral. lib. 22. Cap. 15.

Nostra si qua est humilis justitia, recta forsitan, sed non pura, nisi fortè meliores nos esse credimus quàm patres nostros, qui non minùs veraciter, quam humiliter ajebant, Omnes justitiæ nostræ tanquam pannus menstruatæ malie is. *Quo modo enim pura justitia, ubi adhuc non potest culpa deesse?* Bern. in Serm. 5. de verbis Esajæ prophetæ.

In the last place I shall conclude that *sincerity*, in the way and work of God, (which Scripture also calls by the name of *truth, integrity, simplicity, uprightnesse, perfectnesse, an heart in the work of God, whole and unfeigned*) is that which the covenant of grace doth require, and that which it accepteth; This God in covenant gives in charge, and this he rewards and crownes. The Law stands as a rule, and the charge in it, is, the highest top of perfection, without the least indulgence in any case of failing, suitable to the abilities that once were put into our hands, God in Gospel-condescensions, will have this rule eyed; with a single and upright heart universally eyed, and observed, both in our returnes from sin, and in our application to God in new obedience. *This doing of the will of God from the heart, with good will-doing service*, Eph. 6. 6, 7. *Serving with a willing minde*, 1 Chron. 28. 9. *This preparing the heart to seek the Lord God of our fathers.* Ezra 7. 10. *This delight in the Law of God in the inward man*, Rom. 7. 22. though it be in much weaknesse, and with strength that is little, *Rev.* 3. 8. by reason of inward corruptions, *Rom.* 7. 23. *Gal.* 5. 17. enemies without, *Ephes.* 6. 12. is required of

N3.

The Covenant of grace requires and accepts sincerity.

God in covenant, and through grace accepted. And as faith (which as we have heard is the other new covenant-condition) brings us into communion with God; So this of a ſincere heart and walk, holds in communion, Faith gives acceſſe to God in grace, and through ſincerity we walk with God in grace, to glory; Both of them are called for of God, both accepted with God, and both of them crowned with glory. That in this degree obedience is both required, and accepted, in the Goſpel is evident. This where oever it is, God obſerves and eyes. 2 *Chron.* 16.9. *For the eyes of the Lord runne to and fro throughout the whole earth, to ſhew himſelf ſtrong in the behalf of them whoſe heart is perfect towards him: Herein thou haſt done fooliſhly; therefore, from henceforth thou ſhalt have warres.* Theſe have letters teſtimonial from heaven, *Job* 1. 8. *Haſt thou not conſidered my ſervant* Job, *that there is none like him in the earth? a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and eſcheweth evil?* Gen. 7. 1. *Thee have I ſeen righteous before me in this generation.* According to the degree of this, higher or lower they have praiſe, 2 *Chron.* 29. 34. *The Levites were more upright in heart to ſanctifie themſelves than the Prieſts:* yea, where there is integrity in a ſingle act, this God notes, *Yea, I know that thou didſt this in the integrity of thine heart*, Gen. 20.6. Theſe God protects, & with his omnipotence preſerves; 2 Chron. 16.9. *The eyes of the Lord runne to and fro throughout the whole earth, to ſhew himſelf ſtrong in the behalf of them whoſe heart is perfect towards him. He is a buckler to them that walk uprightly*, Prov. 2.7. In theſe God takes pleaſure; *I know, my God, that thou trieſt the reines, and haſt pleaſure in uprightneſſe*, 1 Chron. 29°. 17. Unto theſe God ſpeaks peace; *Do not my words do good to him that walketh uprightly?* Mich. 2. 7. This the people of God plead with God, as an argument to finde favour in his eyes, *Pſalme* 26.1. *Judge me, O Lord, for I have walked in my integrity*, 1 Chron. 29. 17. *As for me in the uprightneſſe of my heart, I have willingly offered thoſe things*, Pſalme 18. 23. *I was alſo upright before him, &c.* This hath been the high ambition of the ſervants of God in their moſt ſad troubles to reach. *David* begging mercy, ſaith to God, *Behold, thou deſireſt truth in the inward parts*, Pſal. 51. 6. This hath upheld the ſouls of the Saints in their greateſt difficulties, with all joy and conſolation, 2 Cor. 1.12. *For our rejoycing is this, the teſtimony of our conſci-*

ence,

ence, that in simplici y and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdome, but by the grace of God we have had our conversation in the world. Yea, this is a mark of him who is entirely the Lords, professedly, and really his. When the question is put, Who shall dwell in Gods holy hill, Who shall abide in his Tabernacle? answer is returned, *He that walks uprightly, and worketh righteousnesse*, Psal. 15 1,2. And when a like question is put, *Isa.* 33. 14. *Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who amongst us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?* We have the like answer returned in the words that follow, *He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly.* And Jesus seeing *Nathanael*, saith, *John* 1.47. *Behold an Israelite indeed.* There are many Israelites in name, but here was an Israelite indeed, and this is his character, *in whom there is no guile*; His inside was the same with that without. In the discharge of this, the Saints of God have promised to themselves upon good grounds, all happinesse, *Psal.* 119.6. *Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto all thy commandments.* The want of this renders all that is done, void and vaine, as to the acceptation of God, when the heart glances aside, and is not right with God, in worshipping him, doth not seek him. *Matth.* 15.8. *This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is farre from me. Israel is an empty Vine, he bringeth forth fruit to himself*, Hos. 10.1. *Their heart is divided, therefore shall they be found faulty*, verse 2. *Amaziah did that which was good in the sight of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart*, 2Chron. 25.2. *Judah hath not turned unto me with their whole heart, but feignedly*, Jerem. 3. 10. Psal. 78. 34, 35, 36, 37. *When he slew them, then they sought him, and they returned and enquired early after God, and they remembred that God was their rock, and the high God their redeemer; nevertheless they did flatter him with their mouths, and they lied unto him with their tongues, for their hearts were not right with him, neither were they stedfast in his Covenant.* By all which I suppose it is evident that God in covenant calls for obedience, requires integrity of heart in it, will not accept where sincerity of heart is wanting, and where it is, he crowns it with happinesse and glory. And from what hath been spoken, a full definition of the new covenant may be thus given. *A gracious Covenant of God with fallen man, whereby God engages himself upon faith in Christ, and*

The Covenant of Grace defined.

and returne to God in ſincere obedience, to confer on man remiſſion of ſinnes, and all whatſoever that tends to everlaſting happineſſe. They that profeſſe to beleeve and returne to God are in Covenant; They that do beleeve and ſincerely returne, enjoy the bleſſings and mercies of the covenant. This Arminians make the decree of God, and will have no other than ſuch conditional Election, not an Election unto faith and obedience; but becauſe it is foreſeene that men will beleeve and perſevere in ſincere obedience; in which they are oppoſed by the Orthodox. See *Moulins* Anatomy of Arminianiſme, *chap.* 12. *Sect.* 10. This is the covenant of grace publiſhed and promiſed in the Goſpel, which Arminians would make one with Election, confounding the Will of Gods Decree with the Will of his Command, and Promiſe. He that would ſee more into the nature of ſincerity, that he may anſwer to that which God in covenant doth require may peruſe *Ball* on the Covenant, *chap.* 11. and Doctor *Preſton* on *Gen.* 17. 1.

CHAP. XXVI.

The neceſſity of a Miniſtery, to bring men into Covenant with God, and to bring them up to the termes of the Covenant.

FRom hence ſeveral Corollaries may be drawn, and Inferences made. 1. Of the neceſſity of a Miniſtery a conſtant ſtanding Miniſtery, as, to bring men into covenant with God, ſo, to bring them alſo up to the termes of the covenant, to a lively ſaving faith, and ſincere obedience; God works not man into covenant by immediate voice, Neither doth he uſe the Miniſtery of Angels, in his ordinary way of working of it. But when he would take in, the Nations of the world, into covenant with himſelf, he ſends out his Miniſters for that work, giving them a Commiſſion with gifts and abilities ſuitable *to diſciple all Nations*, *Matth* 28.19. Where a Miniſtery comes not, there that people remaine out of covenant, in the ſtate of the Epheſians before their call, as it is ſet out by the Apoſtle, *Epheſ.* 2. 12. *without Chriſt,*

Where a Miniſtery is not, there is no Covenant-people.

Christ, aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. And where the Gospel-covenant is tendered, and not received, there that people continue out of covenant, *rejecting the councel of God against themselves*, Luke 7.30. and rendering *themselves unworthy of everlasting life*, Acts 13.46. This was the case of the people of *Athens*, There *Paul* preacht, yet there he setled (for ought we read) no Church of beleevers, though he had there some particular Converts, *Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, with others*, Acts 17 34. Where the word was delivered, and there received, there was a people in covenant with God, as at *Ephesus, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, &c.* Those Ministers had the honour of planting, of laying the first foundation, of preaching where *Christ before had not been named*, Rom. 15.20. A people thus brought into covenant, do not alwayes come up to the termes of the covenant; All covenanters keep not covenant, their hearts are not steady in it; Therefore there is no lesse necessity of a Ministery, in established Churches, to keep up a people in Covenant with God, through the termes of the covenant to bring them to the happinesse promised, Theirs is the work of watering, of building on anothers foundation, of preaching Christ, where Christ before, at least was known by name, and in some sort professed. That there was such a Ministery in the Church of the Jews, to teach *Jacob his Laws, and Israel his judgements*, to require what God in covenant called for, is not denyed that a Ministery was necessary in the Primitive Apostolique times, to work men into covenant, and for the plantation of Churches, is confest likewise. But when the Apostles left the world, then this order (as some say) fell with them, all Ministerial power died with them. *We are made to beleeve* (saith one) *because the Apostles were ordained by God to be Teachers of the people, and endued with gifts for that end, that therefore there is a like divine, though secret Ordination from God in the making of our Ministers.* Compassionate Samaritane, *page* 24, 25. But if the Scriptures may be heard, this may soone be decided: I shall therefore by arguments make it appear.

Where the Gospel is rendred and refused there is no Covenant.

Where the Gospel is tendred, there is a people in Covenant.

First, that God hath established a Ministery, and appointed it through all the ages of the world to be perpetuated.

Secondly, I shall give reasons to manifest the necessity of such

a Miniſtery to be thus eſtabliſhed and continued.

That ſuch a one is eſtabliſhed, appears

Reaſons proving the eſtabliſhment of a Miniſtery to be perpetuated through all ages.

First, By the work that they have to do, given them in commiſſion, by Chriſt Jeſus, *Matth.*28.19,20. *Go, Diſciple all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghoſt, teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you.* Here is commiſſion given for the diſpenſation of the Word and Sacraments. That of the Word, is either for laying the firſt foundation, or for the ſuperſtruction, either for their work of planting, preaching where Chriſt was never known by name; or elſe for watering, to carry on that happy beginning. Their firſt work in laying the firſt foundation, is given in charge in theſe words, *Diſciple all Nations*, which was not the work of one age. Though *Egeſippus* (as he is quoted by Doctor *Andrews*, Preface to the Decalogue, *page* 7.) ſaith, *That there was no known Common-wealth in any part of the world inhabited, but within fourty years after Chriſts paſſion received a great ſhaking off of Heatheniſh Religion*; yet the whole work after ſo many Centuries of yeeres, is not yet done; Thoſe that are learned in Geography ſay, that there is not above the nineteenth part of the inhabited world, that beares the name of Chriſtian, and a great part of thoſe ſo over-runne with Barbariſme, that they have little more than a name that they live; when yet we beleeve the work ſhall be more univerſal, that as *God was once knowne in* Jury, *his Name great in Iſrael*; So it *ſhall be from the riſing of the Sunne to the going down thereof*, Mal. 1. 11. *And that the Kingdomes of the world ſhall become the Kingdomes of our Lord and of his Chriſt*, Revel. 11. 15. Their work of ſuperſtruction or building up of Diſciples, is given them in charge in theſe words, *teaching them to obſerve all whatſoever I have commanded you.* As long as homage is due to Chriſt, ſo long a Miniſtery is to be continued to call for it, and give directions in it, which we finde farther held out, *Epheſ.*4. 11,13,14,15. There is an enumeration of Miniſterial functions, extraordinary and ordinary, as there is an appointment of Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts; So, alſo of Paſtors and Teachers, their work is there pointed out, *for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Miniſtery, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt*; as alſo their duration and continuance, *till we all come in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Sonne of God, unto*

a

a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulnesse of Christ. When in the world all are Saints, and no imperfection can be found in these Saints, nor any thing wanting in the Mystical body of Christ, when there is not an errour to be found, either in judgement or practice, nor a seducer, or false teacher feared, then, and not before, a Ministery may be spared; This will not be, as long as there is a Devil in Hell, and a man with corruption upon earth. There is not a man that oppoleth a Ministery, but the being of that man is an unanswerable argument for the establishment of it. Their work for dispensation of the Sacraments is given in charge explicitely in those words, *Baptizing them, &c.* as implicitely in that charge, *Teaching them to observe all that I have commanded.* This of Baptisme answers in duration to that other Sacrament of the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor.* 11.26. *As oft as you eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, you shew forth the Lords death till he come.*

Secondly, It appears in the promise of Christ Jesus, annext by way of encouragement in this work, *verse* 20. *Lo, I am with you alwayes, even unto the end of the world.* This is we see to the uttermost extent of time, alwayes, even *all dayes,* to the worlds end. And howsoever some quarrel may be raised about the phrase τὸ αἰῶνος, *Sæculi* being taken in so various an acception in the holy Scriptures; yet the subject matter whereon it is spoken, is a work of more lasting (as hath been observed) than one age, together with the phrase annext; *The consummation or finishing,* plainly signifies that this promise is for perpetuity till Christs coming at the end of ages*. That which puts a period to the Lords Supper, must alone put a period to this work; And for any to make a promise to a dying man, ready to yeeld up the ghost, for help for many years, who is but to live few yeares, were a strange promise; And to settle a function of the Ministery with a promise of assistance through all ages, when it must be extinct in that age, were as strange a promise. A promise to a Non entity, or meere *Chimæra.* Ministers then are in the Church as Starres, not as Meteors; they grow as Plants, not as Mushromes, their duration is not for a yeare, for an age, but through all ages.

Thirdly, this appeares by the Apostles care for a succession, Being not suffered to continue by reason of death, they took care

* There was an end of ages at Christs first coming, *Heb.* 9. 26. There shall be an end of ages at his second coming. See *Gomarus Tom.* 2. *p.* 530.

for others to fill up their places, in the Churches which they had planted. Therefore *Paul* (called not by man, but by a vision and voice from heaven) gives order for a Ministerial call by Ordination, Giving charge to *Titus*, Tit. 1. 5. *to ordaine Elders in every City*, and this by *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, 1 Tim. 4. 14. to whom the care of Church-inspection was by him committed, *Acts* 20. 17. compared with *verse* 28. And *Paul* and *Barnabas* in their journal, *Acts* 14. 23. *Ordained Elders in every Church, and recommended them to God with prayer and fasting*, of which more afterwards.

Fourthly, this appears in the setled Pastors, which were found in constituted, established Churches *Epaphroditus* in *Philippi*, Philip. 2. 25. *Archippus* in *Colosses*, Col. 4. 17. Those of *Ephesus*, which gave the Apostles meeting at *Miletum*, Acts 20. 17. *John* who lived longest of the Apostles, and wrote his Revelation towards the ending of his dayes in the Isle of *Pathmos*, Rev. 1. 9. in his banishment there for the testimony of *Jesus Christ*; writes several Epistles to the Angels, of the several respective Churches in *Asia*, which Angels were to be his survivors, and are not denied by any, to be Ministers of those several City-churches there mentioned, Whether these Churches were such as have been called Diocesan, Presbyterial, or Congregational, is not here to be questioned, but that they were Ministers appointed over their several charges, is out of question.

Fifthly, This appeares by the charge given for respect and esteeme to be given to those who thus stood up in succession in such established Churches, 1 *Thes.* 5. 12, 13. *We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteeme them very highly in love for their works sake.* Phil. 2 29. *Receive him therefore in the Lord with all gladnesse, and hold such in reputation. Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give an account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief, for that is unprofitable for you*, Heb. 13. 17. These were not to be reviled, railed upon; but reverenced, honoured and obeyed; and an Order not in being, is not to be thus honoured.

Sixthly, it appeares by the Ordinance of the Lord Jesus for their liveli-hood and subsistence, 1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14. *Do ye not know*

that

that they which Minister about holy things, live of the things of the Temple? and they which wait at the Altar, are partakers with the Altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel. Here we finde three things implied. 1. That there was a particular order of men in the time of the Law, separated by God for the Ministerial work, and designed by his especial appointment for that businesse. 2. That there is a proportionable Ordinance of Christ in Gospel-times of select men for that businesse. 3. That maintenance by Gods appointment was designed, as for one, so for both in their respective times and succession.

Seventhly, It is farther cleared, by that hand of Providence, that hath answerably provided in all ages, men for this work, in a constant succession. No age since the Apostles, have wanted them; I say not that there was a Ministery in every age, in equal purity and lustre, yet all ages held up that order, and Papacy, when the Minstery was laid most low, found out those that were faithful to Christ Iesus. Some set Providence so high, that they make it a rule of life, as well, as, Scriptures; Me thinks it may be confest, that it gives some light to doubtful Scriptures, The analogy of faith being held firme, somewhat may be gathered from it. To give instance in those Scriptures which seeme to beare witnesse of a glorious call of the Iewes, which most receive, and some question, God so ordering by providence, that in the revolution of so many ages, they still continue a distinct people, separate from others not joyning in their worship, but retaining still their own; and keeping up the Scriptures of the Old Testament, when no such thing can be said of any captivated dispersed people, it seemes to speak that they wait for, and as it were, expect when *the vaile may be taken off; that they may returne to the Lord.* But here, providence seconding such clear Texts of Scripture, such that leave not a doubt behinde them, unlesse men shut their eyes against the Sunne, may sure be acknowledged to be an additional demonstration.

For reasons of the necessity of such an established Ministery to be continued in constituted Churches.

Reasons evincing a necessity of such an established Ministery.

1. The Church of God is to continue, and have its abode through all ages of the world; as long as a world is to continue, so long a Church is to continue, in which God may have glory by

by Christ Jesus, *Ephes.*3.21. and therefore compared to a mountaine, as for eminence, so for continuance, *Psalme* 125. 1. to an house built by Christ himself on a rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevaile. Now a Ministery and a Church cannot be separated; It is of the integrality, if not of the essence of it. A Church setled by a Ministery, may continue being for some time, though in much imperfection, without a Ministery, but will soon be without being. This is confest of all that would hold up a Church in being; whether Episcopal, Independent, or Presbyterial. They that would level a Ministery (which is the work of many) would level all *C*hurches upon earth also. They would drive God from off the earth, and lay his glory in the dust.

2. There must be intercourse between God and his people, between earth and heaven in all ages. It shall at no time be truly said with those Apostates, *Ezek.* 8.12. *The Lord hath forsaken the earth.* Now there must be men designed, Embassadours appointed to carry on this work. As the Priests in the Law were ordained for men in things appertaining to God, as *Heb.*5.1. So the Ministers of the Gospel have a parallel institution in succession, 1 *Cor.*9.14. God in no age carries it on in an immediate way and manner.

3. Take away this Ordinance of a Ministerial function, and all spiritual miseries to an utter confused *Chaos* will presently and necessarily follow. First, *Ignorance*, all spiritual darkness and blindnesse. As the setting of the Sunne brings darkness upon the Horizon, so the absence of a Ministery brings darkness upon the *C*hurch. *They are the light of the world*, Matth.5.14. John Baptist *was a burning light*, John 5.35. Paul *was sent to bring a people from darkness to light*, as *Acts* 26. 18. Their Ministery is called a *Vision*, without them men are without light. It is the highest of contradictions to cry up light, and cry down a Ministerial function. Secondly, *Wickednesse*; this follows from the former. *If a man walk in the night he stumbleth*, (saith our Saviour) *because there is no light in him*, John 11.10. An ignorant man cannot be above a wicked man, *Ephes.*4.18 *Alienated from the life of God by reason of their ignorance that is in them:* As that Prodigal (which the wise man brings in complaining, *that he had not obeyed the voice of his Teachers*) *was almost in all the evil in the midst of the Assembly,*

Assembly, Prov 5.12. So, they may say that want Teachers; *Blinde places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty*, Psal. 74.20. Thirdly, *Errour*, *Heresie*, *Blasphemy*. This is evident. 1. In Reason. Men that want a guide must needs go astray, Sheep without a Shepherd, cannot long hold their walk. The Apostle knew, *that after his departure, ravening wolves would arise, not sparing the flock*, Acts 20.29. What a Wolf is to the flock, that a seducer is to the Church. These waited the opportunity of the Apostles absence; Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered; when there is no shepherd in *Israel*, every man does that which is right in his own eyes, as when there is no King in *Israel*. 2. By Experience, What grosse opinions in worship did the *Israelites* entertaine in *Moses* his fourty days absence from them? Let us go no further than our selves, Since a Ministery in *England* was blasted, and men made it their honour to revile and reproach it; how fruitful have we been in those monsters, from the lowest step of Semiseparation, to the highest pitch of Rantisme? which hath occasioned all those attestations to the truth of Christ Jesus against Errours, Heresies, and Blasphemies of this time, from the Ministers of Christ, in most parts of this Nation, Jesus Christ leaving not himself without witnesse, In which we may see lists of them unto trembling amazement. But if we cannot see it at home, let us heare of it from abroad, from the penne of a Protestant Divine, making observation of the state of the Church in *England*, gives this sad, and too true report unto the world: *That England *in foure yeares space is become an heap and sink of all Errours and Sects, No Province from the beginning of the world, ever brought forth, in so little a space, so many monstrous Heresies, as this.* Honor. Reggus Comment de statu Ecclesiæ in Anglia, pag. 1. Hath Christ any thing that he may enjoy unquestioned among us? As he may not have an Embassadour, so he must not enjoy a Day, or an Ordinance, not so much as his Deity among us. 3. If neither Reason nor experience, will serve to convince us, let the Apostle be heard, *Ephes.* 4.11, 14. *He gave gifts unto men, some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors, and some teachers, that we be not as children tost to and fro, with every winde of Doctrine.* One end of the Ministery is establishment of Saints against Errours. And it is not the least of the cunning sleights of men to throw down a Ministery, that

* *Anglia bis 4. annis facta est colluvies & lerna omnium errorum & sectarum: nulla à condito orbe provincia tam parvo spatio tot monstrosas hæreses protulit, atque hæc. Referunt. Theol. Cestrens. in attestatione sua excusa.* Anno Domini 648.

that errour may be introduced, and Hereſies planted, we muſt not look to be ſecure from Seducers, longer than a Miniſtery ballaſts us.

Objections againſt a Miniſterial Ordinance anſwered Joel 2.28,29. vindicated.

It is objected that in New Teſtament-times, there is a Promiſe, that *God will poure out his Spirit on all fleſh, ſonnes and daughters ſhall prophecy; your old men ſhall dream dreams, your young men ſhall ſee viſions. And alſo upon the ſervants, and upon the handmaids, in thoſe dayes will I poure out my Spirit*, Ioel 2. 28,29 *So that now this office is not with limit to ſome, but promiſcuouſly in all.*

Anſw. Firſt, Old Teſtament-prophecies muſt be underſtood according to New Teſtament-Interpretations, Not alwayes, as in the letter they may ſeem to hold things out, but as the Spirit of God there unfolds them; and as the event to thoſe that live in after-ages in the *C*hurch, cleares them. The rigid adhering to the letter of myſtical prophecies, hath brought many into dangerous ſnares. This holds the Jews in blindneſſe, Looking after a *Meſſiah*, with a temporal rule and power, they will receive no other. This cauſed many in *C*hriſts time, to expect *Elijah* in perſon, and not to regard *John*, who came in the power and Spirit of *Elijah*. This holds thoſe of the *C*hurch of *Rome*, that they ſee not that Antichriſt, who oppoſeth *C*hriſt in a myſtery, but expect one that oppoſeth *C*hriſt openly. And let others take heed, that it do not deceive them, while they look after a perſonal reigne of *C*hriſt upon earth, which ſome myſterious Scriptures ſeeme to imply, when open cleare Texts do manifeſtly contradict.

Secondly, when in New Teſtament-times, this prophecy was firſt fulfilled, obſerve what way was taken for the fulfilling of it, The Spirit comes *in the forme of tongues fiery and cloven, and ſate upon each of the Apoſtles*, and this *Peter* ſayes, was that which was foretold by *Joel* the Prophet, *Acts* 2. 16. There is a ſingular analogy between Scripture-ſignes, and the thing ſignified; whether ordinary in Sacraments, or extraordinary in Viſions. This ſhews in what manner, and way, the Spirit is communicated, in all Languages, and Nations, and that the Spirit is received *by the hearing of Faith*; If *Peter* may interpret *Joel*, a Miniſtery is eſtabliſhed, and not overthrown.

Thirdly, thoſe high expreſſions there, ſerve only to ſet out the a-

abundance of knowledge which men by the Miniſterial work ſhould reach in Goſpel-times; what Prophets then ſaw, and thoſe that ſaw viſions, and dreamed dreames knew, that men of all ranks ſhould ſee, What the Prophets diligently enquired after, 1 *Pet.* 1. 12. they ſhould underſtand.

Fourthly, I could wiſh that theſe men would compare another prophecie of New Teſtament-times, *Zach.* 13. 2. where the Lord promiſes to cauſe *the Prophets, and the unclean ſpirits to paſſe out of the land.* Prophets there, are men of unclean ſpirits; thoſe *falſe ſpirits that are gone out into the world.* Theſe ſhall be brought to a ſerious conviction, *and ſhall be aſhamed every one of his Viſion*, of the ſpirit of the which they uſe to ſpeak, the revelation of which they were wont to boaſt; and ſhall *no longer weare a rough garment to deceive*, ſhall relinquiſh that calling, function or practice, giving in this reaſon; *I am no Prophet, man taught me to keep cattel from my youth.* Becauſe they were bred for husbandry, man another way, therefore they are not for this function; In the caſe of extraordinary inſpiration, this indeed holds not; *Amos* pleads, *Amos* 7. 14. *I was no Prophet, nor a Prophets ſon, but I was an herdman, and a gatherer of Sycamore fruit*; He was thus trained up, and therefore lived in this calling, in which he was trained, till God gave him an extraordinary call; and this he pleads, *The Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord ſaid unto me, Go, propheſie to my people Iſrael*, verſe 15. *Robinſon* the learnedſt Penne (I ſuppoſe) of that party, undertaking to defend the liberty of all, promiſcuouſly to preach the Goſpel, and that it is no proper work of a Select Miniſtery, inſtances in Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who preacht (ſaith he) in the Jewiſh Church without contradiction: And whereas we except againſt this; that they were extraordinarily called, and qualified, he anſwers, that the exception, though true, yet is not of force, for their argument is not that they preached (which their extraordinary call would warrant,) but that they preached and were not excepted againſt by the Jewes; who did not beleeve any extraordinary immediate call of theirs, yet never excepted againſt them; but received them, upon the account of private men, and therefore it appears that it was their ordinary courſe, that any gifted man might preach without control.

Anſ It is wonder, ſo quick-ſighted a man, could not ſee that Chriſt himſelf *Anſw.*

himself was excepted against by the Jewish Elders, and that upon this very point, how often we know not, but we see it upon record, in three several Evangelists that they excepted against him. *The chief Priests and the Elders of the people came to him as he was teaching, and said, by what authority dost thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?* Luke 20. 21. Matth. 21. 23. Mark 11. 27. Their argument runs thus: They that preach the Gospel must have their authority for it. Thou undertakest this work, produce thy authority, let us see thy warrant? Christ answers not, that it was each mans liberty, and duty, who had gifts, as he must have done, else he was wanting in his defence of the truth, in case their proposition had been false, but puts a question, in which he clearly holds out his extraordinary call; The Baptisme of *John*, whence was it, from heaven, or of men? As *John* Baptized, so I preach. He baptized not, neither do I preach without authority, whence we may collect, that he that may presume to set up a new Sacrament, without farther authority, may with the same liberty, undertake to be a Gospel-Preacher.

Object. Jerem. 31. 31, 32, 33, 34. vindicated.

2. That Prophecy is objected, *Jerem.* 31. 31, 32, 33, 34. *This shall be the Covenant that I will make with the house of* Israel; *After those dayes, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me from the least of them, even unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord, for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.*

Answ.

This Text is frequently produced for several purposes, as to assert an unconditional covenant, (that all lies on Gods hand, and we are engaged to nothing) so to decry all Gospel-Ordinances, all use of a Ministery to teach the good knowledge of the Lord; Some make use of it for one of these ends, and confesse it will not serve for both; It will set up an unconditional covenant, but it will not destroy New Testament-Ordinances; Others will have it serve both, when the truth is aright understood, it serves for neicher.

The two first branches of the former answer will give satisfaction here; If Old Testament-Prophecies are to be understood according to New Testament-Interpretations, then no unconditional

onal covenant will here be eſtabliſhed, nor yet Goſpel-Ordinances decryed; ſeeing in the New Teſtament, covenant-conditions are clearly and undeniably held out, and a Goſpel-Miniſtery eſtabliſhed, which already in both parts is fully cleared. A Miniſtery is ſet up with inſtructions to require faith and repentance, and that upon thoſe termes, that without them there is no remiſſion of ſins, no ſalvation.

2. As to that, for which it is here produced, it rather ſerves for overthrow of mutual conferences, Chriſtian communion for mutual edification, than the Miniſterial power. The Text is, not that ye ſhall have no more Teachers in publick; *But they ſhall teach no more every man his brother, and every man his neighbour; for every one ſhall know him, &c.* The Apoſtles charge, *Col.* 3. 16. flies full in the face of this Interpretation, *Let the Word of Chriſt dwell in you plenteouſly in all wiſdome, ſpeaking to one another*, This Prophecie is ſo ſtreined, that there is no need of ſuch admonition, nor any uſe of brotherly exhortations. Certainly neither of theſe inferences from this Prophecie, were in the Apoſtles thoughts, when he exhorted the *Theſſalonians*, 1 Theſ. 5. 11. *Comfort your ſelves together, and edifie one another, even as alſo ye do*, adding in the next verſes: *And we beſeech you brethren to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admoniſh you, and to eſteem them very highly in love for their works ſake, &c.* The councel had been more ſutable, to have bid them to have ceaſed this mutual conſolation, and edification; And, as for th ſe that were over them, that diſtinction of *over*, and *under*, was Antichriſtian, that they muſt ceaſe to honour, and make it their buſineſſe to level them. But above all, it is wonder, how thoſe that are high, in ſetting up, all for Teachers, and will have liberty of prophecie promiſcuous, can with face urge this Text, The letter of it being againſt, *brother and brother, neighbour and neighbour, teaching one another*, and not againſt a Miniſterial way for edification.

3. For the full interpretation of the words, that of King *James* muſt be acknowledged; In myſtical prophecies, it is farre more eaſie to confute an abſurd interpretation; than finde out a true one. One that joynes in the former part, to eſtabliſh an unconditional covenant, againſt New Teſtament-light, yet leaves them in the latter, and ſays, The *not teaching one another, there ſpoken*

of, is meant of that obscure teaching which was under the Law. I wish that his party would here heed him, and that himself would consider, that when he would have them to recede from the rigid adhering to the letter of this part of the prophecie, for overthrow of all helps for knowledge, whether he have not equal cause to recede from that which he, would with like rigour fasten upon it; I shall undertake as clearly from the New Testament, to hold out conditions in the covenant of Grace; as any other man shall finde either warrant, or Ordinance for publick, or private admonition or exhortation; *They shall not have so much need of teaching as formerly*, say the *Annotations* on that place, and it is plaine, that, that is often spoken in Scripture negatively; that is meant comparatively; *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice*, Hos. 6. 6. When he would have both mercy and sacrifice, though mercy preferred above sacrifice *Calvin* hath fully spoken to this objection, satisfying both his Adversary and his Reader, giving them a full refutation, and the Text a good interpretation: (a) *In that some phantastick spirits*, (saith he,) *take occasion from hence to abolish all outward preaching of the Word, as though in the Kingdom of Christ it were superfluous, their madnesse may easily be answered. This is their objection:* (saith he) *After the coming of Christ a man ought not to teach his neighbour; let an outward Ministery then be gone, and give way to an inward inspiration. But they passe that by* (saith our Author) *that in the Prophet which is chiefly worthy of observation; The Prophet doth not deny that one should teach another, but these are his words; They shall not teach one another, saying, Know the Lord; as though he should say, such ignorance should not possesse the minds of men as heretofore, that they should not know who the Lord is, for we know there is a twofold use of teaching. First, That those that were altogether ignorant, may begin with the first elements; and afterwards that they that are thus entered, may make a farther*

a *Quòd autem fanatici homines hinc occasionem arripiunt, abolendæ externæ prædicationis, acsi sub Christi regno esset superuacua, facilè eorum insania refellitur. Hæc eorum est objectio Post Christi adventum non debet quisq; proximum suum docere, sacessat igitur externum Ministerium, ut internæ Dei inspirationi detur locus. Atqui præterierunt quod in primis animadversione dignum erat. Neque enim in totum Propheta negat quin docturi sint alii alios, sed hæc sunt verba, non docebunt, dicendo, Cognosce Dominum, acsi diceret, non amplius occupabit hominum mentes ignorantia qualis antehac, ut nesciant quis sit Deus Scimus autem duplicem esse Doctrinæ usum Primò, ut qui pœnitus rudes sunt a primis elementis incipiant deinde ut qui jam sunt initiati majores faciant progressus. Quum ergo Christianis quamdiu vivunt proficiendum sit, certum est, neminem usque adeò sapere, quin doceri opus habeat, ut pars non postrema sapientiæ nostræ sit docilitas; Quæ autem proficiendi sit ratio si velimus esse Christi discipuli, Paulus ostendit ad Ephes. cap. 4. 11. Constituit Pastores & Doctores, &c. Hinc apparet nihil minùs Prophetæ venisse in mentem, quàm spoliari Ecclesiam tam necessario bono.*

ther progresse. Therefore when Christians as long as they live ought to learn, there is none so wise, but need to be taught, so that a teachable disposition is not the least part of wisdome, and whatever way to profit is, if we will be Christs Disciples, Paul *sheweth in his Epistle to the* Ephesians, chap.4.11. *He gave gifts unto men; some Pastours, some Teachers, &c. Whence it appears that nothing else came into the Prophets thoughts, than to spoile the Church of so great a benefit.* Thus far judicious *Calvin* on *Heb.* 8. *verse* 8, 9, 10, 11. In case these words [*not only*] might be supplied as some would have it, *men shall not only teach one another, Know the Lord, but all shall know me*; giving instances of the like, of necessity to be supplyed in other Scriptures, then the whole scope of the place were cleared: For the Jews as they did make use of the teaching of men, so, for the generality they rested in it; Here they are taught that which they never minded, the necessity of the concurrence, of Gods teaching with mans, that when man discovers the object, God should put in frame the Organ. Certain it is, that when other prophecies foretell in New Testament-times, mens zeal, to stirre up one another in the knowledge of God, (as *Isa.*2.3. *Zech.*8.21,22,23. yea, the very Chapter whence this prophecie is taken, *ver.*6. and the Apostles in the New Testament call upon men for the mutual help of each other for edification) this Prophecie does not stand alone for the destruction of it.

CHAP. XXVII.

Schooles and Nurseries of Learning, in order to a gifted Ministery necessary.

AS a Ministery is to be established, to bring men into Covenant, and to bring them up, to the termes of the covenant, so all that necessarily conduces to it, is necessarily to be provided. First, Nurseries, Seminaries, Seed-plots, for gifts and abilities fitting for it, and sutable to it. *Qui vult finem, vult media*, is a certain rule; the end ever supposes the way to it. He that will be a workman, must have tools; He that will fight a battel, must have

armes; He that will make a Purchaſe, muſt have moneys; As, other things, ſo, the Miniſtery muſt have its due preparations. Chriſt having commiſſioned the twelve, for the work of diſcipling Nations, they muſt not ſet upon it, till they were enpoured for it. We have not inſpiration; that is to be ſupplied by education, the way that *Paul* gave in charge to *Timothy*, *Give attendance to reading*, 1 Tim. 4.13. *Meditate wholly on theſe things, that thy profitting may appear to all*, verſe 15. As he had not health by miracle, but in the uſe of means, 1 *Tim.* 5. 23. ſo, neither had he gifts for the Miniſtery, but by ſtudy. A way for the advancement of ſtudy is therefore neceſſary, and though neither Law nor Goſpel, do in the letter expreſſely appoint them; no more than they did Synagogues for the Jewes, and the like places of Aſſembly for Chriſtians, yet by way of neceſſary conſequence, both Law, and Goſpel call for them, ſeeing they expreſſely call for that, which without theſe cannot be effected. A School to teach letters, with the Art of ſpelling, that we may be able to read, is not any where appointed, The Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking to men of the light of Reaſon; and requiring knowledge of the Law by ſearching the Scriptures, and meditation in it, knew, this was needleſſe: As petty Schooles for private Chriſtians, ſo are Schooles of a higher nature, for the Miniſterial Function; Therefore, as all Sects whatſoever had their Schooles, to advance their way; *Stephen* met with ſome of them at *Jeruſalem*, *Paul* at *Athens*, ſo, we finde the like for the propagation of the knowledge of the Law of God, The Sonnes of the Prophets ſay to *Eliſha*, 2 King. 6. 1. *Behold, the place where we dwell is too ſtrait for us.* Sonnes of Prophets, were no other than Pupils, or Scholars of the Prophets, and we ſee, that they made their abode together, and their number encreaſed; To this *Solomon* alludes in the *Proverbs*, in the Perſon of Wiſdom, *My ſonne, receive my inſtruction*; and our Saviour alſo, *Wiſdom is juſtified of all her children*, Mat. 11. 19. Such a place there was at *Naioth* in *Ramah*, whither *David* fled, and *Saul* followed him, 1 *Sam.* 19. 20. There was *Samuel*, and a company of Prophets. *Naiothum venerunt, &c. They came to* Naioth, *which was the dwelling of the Prophets, who exerciſed themſelves in the Law of God, that the doctrine of ſalvation might be propagaed throughout the whole region of* Iſrael. So *Calvin* on the place, *Naioth habitatio quædam, &c.* Naioth *was the dwelling of the Prophets in* Ramah, *where the be-*

Univerſities of neceſſary uſe.

leevers

leevers gave themselves up to the study of Gods Law, and were called the sonnes of the Prophets. Pellican *in locum*, pag. 200 And from these words *Willet* on the place (out of *Peter Martyr*) concludes, that *The noble foundation of Universities, and Schools of Learning, is grounded upon the example of the Prophets.* To this end there was a Colledge in *Jerusalem*, where *Huldah* the Propheteſſe did live, 2*Chron.* 34 22. And *Jeremy* who lived in the same time, speaks of the Prophets of *Jerusalem*, as of the Prophets of *Samaria*, Jerem. 23. 13, 14. In either places they had, as appeares, Schooles of the Prophets. After the destruction of *Jerusalem*, Schooles for learning were still held up by the Jewes. They had their University in *Tiberias*, as *Weemes* observes, *Christian Synagogue, page* 148. *In* Babylon, saith he, *there were three famous Universities*, Neharda, Sora *and* Pambeditha. He farther saith, *Colledges were appointed to receive strangers, and were called* Labrothenu, *which is corruptly read* Libertines, *Acts* 6.9. By the same providence, on like warranty in the dayes of the Gospel, they have been set up at *Alexandria, Antioch*, where many famous men taught publickly (saith *Willet* further out of *Martyr*,) as *Pentianus, Origen, Clemens.* These through Gods goodnesse are continued; whereſoever the Gospel is preached, so that the use of Schools, the necessitie of Universities, is evident as well in Scripture as the light of Reason.

Objections answered.

Object. *But the Universities of* Europe *are a cause of universal sinens and plagues, we want the Universities, the Seminaries and Seed plots of all Piety. But have not those fountaines, ever sent what streames the times liked, and ever changed their taste and colour, according to the Princes eye and palate?* Bloody tenent, *page* 173.

Object.

Answ. So from the Prophets of *Jerusalem* (as *Jeremy* complaines) profaneneſſe went into all the land, Their Universities (it seemes) were as foul as ours, which the Prophet bewailed, and had a zeal to purge, but not to destroy and wholly ruinate. The streams from thence (blessed be God) have not run in one channel. We have from thence sweet waters (as well as bitter streams) *that have made glad the Cities of God.*

Answ.

Object. *I honour Schooles for Tongues and Arts, but the institution of* Europes *Universities, devoting Persons, for Schollars in a Monastical way, forbidding marriage and labour too, I hold* (saith one) *as farre from the minde of Jesus Christ, as it is from the propagating*

Object.

of

Sol. *of his name and worship.* Bloody Tenent. *page* 173. *Answ.* I am of your minde, They very well agree to both, as may sufficiently appeare in that which hath been said They that propagate his Name and worship, must know it; and this is the way to attaine to knowledge, For the forbidding of labour, I know no such expresse statute, but the very being of Schools, of this kinde is inconsistent with it. A School for Tongues, and Arts, cannot be a shop for Trades, Can we think, those Sons of the Prophets that studied under *Elisha*, or those Prophets under *Samuel*, had their employments of manufactures or tillage? If they had been men of labour, they would sure have had an Axe among them, and not have been put to borrow. To be a Prophet and an Husbandman, as *Zach.*13.5. *taught from youth to keep cattel*; cannot stand together, as hath been shewn. The Levites had no land for tillage, nor yet do we read that they drove any trades, Their work we finde prescribed them, *Deut.* 33.10. *They shall teach* Jacob *thy judgements, and* Israel *thy Laws, they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt-offering before the Altar.* So for Ministers of the Gospel, we hear of their *labour in Word and Doctrine*, their charge *to preach in season and out of season.* For the forbidding of marriage; there is no such thing, who hath not known men, in that state in the Universities, and Resident in Colledges? It is true that those Students, that have their maintenance from the Founders donation, upon marriage lose their place, but do not incurre expulsion. And the thing is very equal, seeing those places are not intended for a setled abode, (as some abuse them) but for Preparation for publick employment, whether in Church or State, and who blames those ties of Apprentices from marriage, for the terme of their service to know their trades? If wives and families should be taken in, they would soon finde the inconvenience that the sonnes of the Prophets complained of, their dwellings would be too strait for them.

Object. Object. *Have not the Universities sacrilegiously stole this blessed name of Christs Scholars from his People? Is not the very Scripture-language it self become absurd, to wit, to call Gods People, especially women* (as *Dorcas*) *Scholars?* Bloody tenent, *ibid.*

Answ. And was it not an equal sacriledge, for some peculiar men to take the title of the Sons of the Prophets, who (as it is plain) were not their children, but their Scholars, and therefore the Prophets, (under whose

whose tuition they were) were called by them, as, by the name of Father, 2*King.* 2. 12. so, also by the name of Master, 2*King.* 6. 5. being those Masters of the Assemblies that the Wise man speaks of, *Eccles.* 12. Others heard the doctrine, and as sons received the instructions of the Prophets as well as they, yet the title is given peculiarly to some, who in a peculiar way were separate for that work, not common to all men, much lesse to women. Besides, the word Scholler is plainly in relation to Schooles, men may learn Christ and be his disciples, is confest, though they be not Scholars in this way.

Object. *I know no Schooles of the Prophets in the New Testament, but the particular Congregation of Christ Jesus. And I question whether it be any thing but sinne that hath dried up this current of the Spirit, in those rare gifts of tongues, to Gods sonnes and daughters, serving so admirably, both for the understanding of the Original Scriptures, and also for the propagating of the Name of Christ. Who knows but that it may please the Lord, again to cloath his People, with a Spirit of zeal, and courage for the Name of Christ, yea and poure forth those fiery streames again of tongues, and prophecy in the restauration of Zion?* Bloody tenent page 174. I am glad to here it confessed, that sinne is displeasing to God, and that any judgement on the Church is confest to be let in at this gate; I am glad farther to hear that tongues serve, so admirably to propagate the Name of Christ, whence I infer, that while this judgement for sin continues, there is a necessity of other courses to attaine this, that is acknowledged to be of this excellency. Since the judgement was laid on the earth for sin, men have got their bread with labour, and so must as long as the judgement remaines. The like paines must be for learning as for a living; When God shall please to poure out again these fiery streames, we then shall confesse the unusefulnesse of Schools to this purpose, in the mean space their use is evident. And seeing it is acknowledged that *men must digge with daily study, and labour to come at the Original fountaines*; let none be like *Pharaoh* to urge a tale of brick, and deny straw. If they must thus digge, let them not be necessitated to go to the Papists to sharpen their spades, as sometimes *Israel* to the *Philistines*, with their goads and mattocks, which yet necessarily will be, if their Schools be kept up, and ours cried down. Mr. *Ainsworth* is brought in for an instance, who (as is said) *had scarce his peer, among a thousand*

Academians for the Scripture-Originals, and yet he ſcarce ſet foot within a Colledge walls. His abilities in the tongues is evident (which was his Maſter-piece) but his education I know not, but one Swallow makes not a Spring. I have known a man excellent, in the moſt exquiſite manual trade, who yet never ſerved a Maſter to learn it, yet this never took men off the way of Apprentiſhips. If Mr. *Ainſworth* ſcarce ſet foot in a Colledge walls, yet he reaped the fruit of their labours that were ſtudied, and this way excelled. Is this the honour that you profeſſe to give to Schools for Tongues and Arts, to perſwade men not to ſet their foot within them?

Object. Another goes yet here farther, not only to put down Schooles, and demoliſh Academies for learning, but to deny any neceſſity or uſe of learning at all, yea, any neceſſity of a Miniſtery for interpretation of Scripture, as the *Compaſſionate Samaritane*, page 29,30,31. *One intereſt* (among others by him named) *of Miniſters, is to perſwade the people, that the Scriptures, though we have them in our tongue, are not yet to be underſtood by us, without their help, and interpretation, ſo that in effect we are in the ſame condition with thoſe we have ſo long pitied, that are forbid to have the Scriptures in their own tongue; for it is alone, not to have them in our own tongue, and to be made beleeve that we cannot underſtand them, though we have them in our own. Is the cabinet open to us? and do we yet want a key? has ſo much labour been ſpent? ſo many tranſlations extant, and are we yet to ſeek? Let us argue a little with them; either the Scriptures are not rightly tranſlated, or elſe they are; if they are not, why have we not been told ſo all this while? why have we been cheated into errours? if they are rightly tranſlated, why ſhould not Engliſh men underſtand them? The idiomes and proprieties of the Hebrew and Greek languages, which ſome ſay, cannot word for word be expreſt in Engliſh, might all this while have been tranſlated into as many Engliſh words, as will carry the ſenſe thereof.*

For the dilemma concerning the Scriptures rightly tranſlated, or not rightly; I may apply that of *Job, chap. 6. verſe* 15. *How forcible are right words, but what doth your arguing reprove?* and anſwer in a word, that they are rightly tranſlated according to the reach of a humane work, and more rightly than the tranſlation followed ſo much by the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles. I ſuppoſe, all will yeeld that ours is more exact after the Original, than

saw

was that of the Seventy; And yet there was no cheat in those translations; if there had, those witnesses of Christ had not been silent; and yet not such a perfection that will bear no amendment. There is still use of examination of them, of asserting and defending them; But be it granted that the translation is every way exact and full, does it follow that there needs no help or interpretation? The people of the Jewes had the Original it self, and spake the language in which Scripture was written; yet *the Priests lips were then to preserve knowledge, and the people were to seek the law at his mouth*, Mal. 2 6. The cabinet was open to them, as it is to us; yet there needed a key for farther opening. Those two Disciples, with whom Christ had to deale with, upon the way, had the Scriptures, either in the translation, or Original, as is evident from Christs own words, reproving them for *not beleeving all that the Prophets had written*, and yet a key of interpretation was needful, and useful; *Christ opened unto them the Scriptures*, Luke 24. 32. If this *Compassionate Samaritane* were questioned (as the *Eunuch* was by *Philip*) *understandest thou what thou readest?* he would not have given his answer, *How shall I understand without an Interpreter?* But would streight have answered, Yes, as well as any linguist in the world; I have no need of your help for interpretation. The cabinet is open, spare your key. This was one of the Arts, that some Prelates made use of, to keep up a reading Ministery, to perswade, that Scriptures were so plaine distinctly read in our own tongue, that they might be understood without any interpretation. But the plainnesse and easinesse of a rule, and the use of means for understanding of it stand together; We maintaine a plainnesse in Scripture for the simple to understand, but not sitting idle, and lazy; but searching the Scriptures, and making use of those gifts of Christ, which he shed forth from the right hand of the Father, *for the edifying of his body, till we come into the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Sonne of God, unto a perfect man. That we might not henceforth be as children, tossed to and fro with every winde of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftinesse of those that lie in waite to deceive*, Ephes. 4. 12, 13. We may soone see their artifice that labour to beare them down, Thus they know their cunning sleight may be carried in the dark, and their impostures lie undiscovered. Our compassionate man, pretending to avoid a

cheat; acts the part of the moſt notable cheater. The Prophet ſtood for that office of the Prieſts, that their lips ſhould preſerve knowledge, even when they had corrupted the covenant of *Levi*, Whatſoever their way was, yet this was their duty, ſo muſt we for the Stewards of the myſteries of God, It is their work to diſpenſe them, and the people are to ſeek at their mouthes for them. But enough I hope hath been ſpoke for a Miniſtery, for a knowing Miniſtery, and objections againſt it fully ſatisfied.

CHAP. XXVIII

An orderly way of admiſſion of men, into the Miniſterial function neceſſary.

Self-conſecration to the Miniſterial work unwarrantable.

AS men for the Miniſtery are to be trained up for the work, So there muſt be an orderly way of admittance to it, the way which Scripture traces out to us. Self-conſecration is alone beſeeming the Prieſts of *Jeroboam*, 2Chron. 13. 9 the loweſt of the people that have neither inſpiration, nor education, *that have been taught of men* (not any thing that may conduce to the dividing of the Word aright; but) *how to keep cattel*, Zach. 13. 5. or ſome anſwerable employment, in its due place commendable, but no introduction to the Miniſterial honour. Theſe run, and ſtay not for ſending, and going without commiſſion, they go without aſſiſtance, and ſoon runne themſelves into thoſe bogges, in which without ſpecial grace, they are irrecoverably plunged; they want home reproofs, *the wounds of friends*, Zach. 13. 6. that they *may no longer wear a rough garment to deceive*; When the Apoſtle layes down the greateſt neceſſitie of preaching, he puts the queſtion, *How ſhall they preach, unleſſe they be ſent?* Men that go upon this work, muſt be able to make good their call. The Miniſtery of the Goſpel being of divine inſtitution, as well as the Prieſthood of the Law; there muſt be a call from God for the one as for the the other; *Heb.* 5. 4. *No man taketh this honour unto himſelfe, but he that is called of God, as was* Aaron. There is none that expect not a call from God in this work, but have their brand

brand in the Scripture, *Jerem.* 14.14. *The Lord said unto me, The Prophets propheſie lies in my name, and I ſent them not; yet they ſay, ſword and famine ſhall not be in this land: by ſword and famine ſhall thoſe Prophets be conſumed*, Jerem. 27.15. *For I have not ſent them, ſaith the Lord, yet they propheſie a lie in my name, that I might drive you out, and that ye might periſh, and the Prophets that propheſie unto you.* And as they runne on their own heads, ſo they vent their own tenents, and *propheſie out of the deceit of their owne hearts*, Jerem. 23.26. Thoſe ſhall never finde comfort in the work, that are not able to ſay with the Apoſtle, *Chriſt ſent me to preach the Goſpel*, 1 Cor. 1.17.

A call from God to the Miniſterial work muſt be expected.

1. The work is Gods, the advancement and ſetting up of his Kingdome, the ruine and demolition of the Kingdome of Satan, *Acts* 26.18. The whole of all that they do is of high concernment to him; Each man will ſee to his own buſineſſe, and finde labourers for his own work; God hath no leſſe care, Jeſus Chriſt is no leſſe mindful, Harveſt-Maſters provide harveſt-labourers; The Maſter of this harveſt provides labourers for his work, and gives them commiſſion, *Mat.* 9 38.

2. All neceſſaries for the work, inward, outward, are to be ſupplied from him. They muſt have livelihood and proviſion from heaven, they muſt receive inſtruction from heaven, They muſt be taught of God, that they may teach; God muſt protect, he muſt encourage and embolden, he muſt command ſucceſſe, and give encreaſe. They are agents in his hand, and muſt be appointed by him; it is no marvel, if they that be not ſent of him, be left deſtitue of all.

3. He is a God of Order, and he will have Order obſerved; and in no way is Order ſeene ſo comely, as when all know their places, and ſtations; When in a great houſe or a mighty Army, each man will do what work he pleaſes; undertake what place of truſt and command he pleaſes; each Souldier in an army will be a Commander, each ſervant in a family a Steward, there muſt needs be high and great confuſion. The manifold abſurdities that will unavoidably follow, in caſe each man may thruſt himſelf into this work, and ſo drive on his own intereſts, ſee in Maſter *Hall his Pulpit guarded, Argument.* 5. This power of putting men into this work, equally concernes the whole Trinity, Each one of the perſons hath his hand in the ſe-

paration of men for it; Jesus Christ in a vision, sent *Paul* upon this errand, *Acts* 26.18. see further, 1 *Cor.* 1.17. *Eph.* 4.11. He is, an *Apostle by the will of God*, Col. 1.1. which is understood of the Father. God set in the Church, *first Apostles, secondarily Prophets*, 1 Cor. 12. 28. The Holy Ghost hath here an hand, *Acts* 13.2. *The holy Ghost said, Separate me* Barnabas *and* Saul, *for the work whereunto I have called them*, Acts 20. 28. *Take heed therefore unto your selves, and to all the flock over which the holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* And this sending or authorizing, is, as their gifting, or fitting, either extraordinary and immediate, nothing of man intervening; or else mediate by mans Ministery and his approbation. *Paul* had both an immediate way; both his authority, and ability for the work; he professes that he is an Apostle, not of man, nor by man; he owes it not to man as the Authour, so may any Minister of Christ say, he owes it not to man as an instrument; so only Prophets and Apostles can say: As his Calling was thus immediate, so in like sort was his instructions for it, *Gal.* 1.12. *For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it; but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ.* They that divide these, are exceedingly to blame; assuming authority without man, but confessing that for abilities, as they must look up to God, so they must make use of man, must apply themselves to reading, and make use of the helps of others.

The call of God is either extraordinary and immediate, or ordinary and mediate by the Ministery of men.

The immediate Call is by Vision, Revelation, or whatsoever otherway God pleases to manifest himself. Thus in a vision *Paul* was called; where that is not, the mediate Call only remains, which is the way of all that attaine to gifts by education, study, and the blessing of heaven on their endeavours. This is called, as in Scripture, so in Church-writers, by the name of *Ordination*, and the whole work (containing as well that which is essential to it, as the adjuncts of it) may be thus described. *An act of men in a Ministerial function, associated in a Presbytery; setting some apart upon proof and examination, as Presbyters and Elders in the Church, by fasting and praying with imposition of hands.* We find no other, but men in Ministerial function, in all the holy Scriptures acting in it. *Paul* and *Barnabas* ordaine Elders in every Church, which in their journal they visite, *Acts* 14. 23. *Timothy* is directed in the way of it. 1 *Tim.* 5.22. *Lay hands suddenly on no man.*

The immediate call is by vision, revelation, &c.

The mediate and ordinary call is by Ordination.

Ordination described, and in the several parts of it explained.

Men in Ministerial function are to act in it.

Ti-

Titus is enjoyned *to ordaine Elders in every City in Creet*, Tit. 1. 5. He is named alone, but the naming of one excludes not others, and therefore it appears, that in *Timothies* Ordination, a Presbytery, or a combination of Presbyters did joyne, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. which way in our Church hath ever been held. The Bishop (supposed by some, to be vested in the whole power of Ordination) never had authority to ordaine alone; but grave Presbyters according to the Canon, were to joyn with him, though by reason of greatnesse, his vote ordinarily did overmuch sway in it. Some would have the people here to have their hand, in that the word χειροτονήσαντες in that place of the *Acts*, *chap.* 14. 23. implies *a lifting up of the hand.* But whatsoever the word in its Etymology may imply, the use is not such, as is plaine by comparing *Acts* 10. 41. where the immediate Ordination of God, by the same word is held forth unto us. They know the weight of the Ministerial function, and they are best able to judge of requisite abilities. One that is willing to give as much to the people, as may be, yet confesses that in Grammatical construction, the word χειροτονήσαντες can agree with no other but *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and that it was only their act; and therefore he would finde it in the word κατὰ ἐκκλησίαν, which (saith he) *doth not signifie in every Church, as it is translated, but according to the Church*, instancing in the Orators phrase, *Faciam secundum te*; *I will do it according to thy minde*: So they (viz. *Paul* and *Barnabas*) ordained them Elders, *according to the Church, that is, according to the minde and will of the Church.* If this were granted, it would only conclude an acquiescency in the people, and that they had satisfaction in that Ordination, carryed on by *Paul* and *Barnabas*. Yet this phrase here, can no where prove that the Church or people; made choise of them, then we man prove from that injunction of the Apostle, *Titus* 1. 5. *to ordaine Elders in every City*, that the whole City had there their vote in Elections; As much stresse may be laid upon κατὰ πόλιν *in every City*, or according to the minde of the City, in this of *Paul* to *Titus*, as upon κατ' ἐκκλησίαν *in every Church*, or according to the minde of the Church, in that of *Luke* in the History of the *Acts*. What power the people or the faithful may have in Election, and how farre it may be convenient that they may be overborne for their good, I will not here dispute. I only conclude, that we finde not the people any where

where ordaining we read of Ordination in Churches, for the Churches use, not Ordination by Churches, taking it in that sense, for the whole community of Beleevers.

This Ordination is of Presbyters and Elders.

These, in a Ministerial function in this act of Ordination, set select men apart for Presbyters, or Elders; so *Acts* 14.23. *Titus* 1.5. *Titus* is enjoyned to ordaine Elders in every City in *Creet*, who are the same with Bishops, as appeares in *Titus* 1. *verse* 5. 7. compared. The qualification of Elders is there prescribed; and the reason is given, *for a Bishop must be blameless*, which will hold no congruity, if an Elder be not the same with a Bishop, Which also may be seen, *Acts* 20. comparing *ver.* 17. and the 28. together. The Apostle there speaks to the Elders of *Ephesus*, and he gives them a charge, *to take heed to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers*; that is, had given them an Episcopal charge, as the word signifies. Elders must set apart men for Elders, and Presbyters are to be set apart by a Presbytery.

These Elders are the same with Bishops.

They are Elders of the Church universal.

This Ordination of Elders is to be in the Church, or for the Church, which may be taken either for the universal Church visible, or for some particular Church, and that either congregational or classical. Ministerial functions are appointed of God, for the Church universal visible. *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, &c.* 1*Cor.*12 28. No one particular Church, congregational or classical, enjoys all the particular kindes there enumerated, yet so as the exercise of this function, is to be with limit to one particular only. They are Ministers of the Church universal; yet so as orderly to exercise their function, only there, where God by his providence shall designe them. There are some functions (as I may say) *Catholick*, what such a one doth any where in his function, is good every where, as a publick Notary, or Master of the Chancery, that which they do any where, is every where valid, within the limit of that power under which they act; It is of force through the whole Nation. Some functions are *topical* or *local*, as Justices of Peace, a chief officer in a Corporation, Sheriff, or Constable, who are without power out of their own limits. A Minister or Presbyter is a Catholick or Universal Officer, he hath *jus in re*, in the whole Church visible, for all Ministerial actions, whether of Word or Sacraments, he hath *jus ad rem*, in the place assigned and

and appointed him, where alone he is regularly to officiate, and so, hath the titse of an Angel, or Elder of such a particular Church to which he is called, *Rev.* 2. 1, 7, *&c. Acts* 20. 17. He hath a first right every where, a second right only where he is orderly placed.

Ordination is to be past on examination or trial.

This is to be done by examination or tryal, if no word of Scripture did mention it, yet the thing it self evinces the necessity of it; Scripture layes down the requisites or qualifications in Ministers. First, for years, *not a novice*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 6 Some are old young, which may answer some want of years, more fit at twenty foure, then others at thirty. Secondly, for conversation; *Blamelesse, as the Steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate,* Titus 1. 7, 8. Thirdly, for parts and gifts; 2 *Tim.* 2. 15. *A workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of Truth,* Tit. 1. 9. *Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince gain-sayers.* Fourthly, for graces of the Spirit, they should be as *Barnabas, full of the Holy Ghost and of Faith*, Acts 11. 24. From which gifts of nature must not be excluded, as strength of body in its measure, that the body may in some sort keep pace with the soule. The gift of utterance, that not only his head, but *his lips may preserve knowledge*, that he may be able to speak, *to edification, exhortation, and doctrine*; of these such that act in Ordination, should have knowledge, of each of them so far, as they may come to cognizance, of some of these by letters of commendation *from faithful persons*, 2 *Cor* 3. 1. of others by proof and examination, 1 *Tim.* 3. 10. The Apostle having laid down the qualifications of Bishops, and proceeding to that of Deacons; hath these words, *Let these also be proved, and then let them use the office of a Deacon*; both Bishops and Deacon must undergo examination. Timothy *must lay hands suddenly on none*, 1 Tim. 1. 22. He must then lay on his hands no otherwise, but upon proof and trial, which the context (speaking of sins, some open going before to judgement, others following after) seems to evince, such cautiousness cannot stand; without all possible wayes and means of proof and trial.

All this is to be solemnized by fasting and prayer; in which we

To be solemnized with fasting and prayers,

have Scripture-precedents, *Act.* 13.2. *When they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away,* Acts 14.23. *When they had ordained them Elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they beleeved.* This I take not, to be of the essence of Ordination; not necessary to the very being; but the better being of it in imploring Gods assistance and blessing. It is a great work, a work of glorious concernment; it is a work above our strength to manage, more weighty than our shoulders can bear, there is more than parts, gifts and endowments, (whether natural or acquired) required in it. All supplies being (as before we heard) to be expected from heaven, heaven must be implored, God must be earnestly sought in it. Fasting should add wings to our prayers, *that our voice may be heard on high.* A shadow of this still remained in the Church, as appears, by those *Jejunia quatuor temporum* at the times of Ordination, which indeed, was almost brought to a meer shadow.

Imposition of hands to be used in Ordination.

The last thing mentioned in the Definition, is imposition of hands; A rite or usage in practice before the Law, *Gen.* 48. 14. held in the time of the Law, *Levit.* 1.4. and continued in the dayes of the Gospel, as consisting with the simplicity of it. It was used in *blessing*, Gen. 48. 14. Israel *stretched out his right hand, and laid it upon* Ephraims *head in his blessing of them.* Matth. 19 13. *They brought children to Christ, that he should put his hands on them and pray*; which accordingly he did, *Mark* 10. 16. *He put his hands upon them, and blessed them.* It was used in *Offerings*, Levit. 1.4. *If any man bring an Offering unto the Lord, he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him, to make atonement for him.* It was used in *bearing witnesse*, as *Levit.* 24.14. where the Lord gives charge concerning the blasphemer; *Bring forth him that hath cursed, without the Camp, and let all that have heard him, lay their hands upon his head.* It was used in conferring *extraordinary gifts*, Acts 8. 17. *Peter* and *John* laid their hands, on those that *beleeved in Samaria, and they received the Holy Ghost.* It was used in *miraculous cures*, Mark 6. 5. *Christ could do there no mighty works, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folke, and healed them,* Acts 28. 8. It was used in *designing men for office*, *and that either civil*, for the work of the Magistracy. *Deut.* 34.9. Joshua *the son of* Nun *was*

full

full of the Spirit of wisdome; *For* Moses *had laid his hands upon him, and the children of* Israel *hearkened unto him, and did as the Lord commanded* Moses. Or Ecclesiastical, and that for the work of the Lord in the time of the Law, *Levit.* 8. 10. and also in the dayes of the Gospel, *Acts.* 13. 3. And from this rite of imposition of hands, (in use in this work of Ordination) the whole work hath sometimes its denomination, 1 *Tim.* 5 22. *Lay hands suddenly on no man*; where imposition of hands is put for the whole work. Some I know would take all this off, as to Ordination by laying on of hands, by the objection of extraordinary gifts, which were this way conferred, as was before confessed, of which they will have that Text understood, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.* But this is too weak to avoid it, for though we have already said; that when the Holy Ghost was given in those extraordinary endowments, hands were imposed, yet whole Presbyteries cannot ordinarily be conceived, to be vested with that power, yet they joyntly in this work laid on their hands, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. And that advice of *Paul* to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. plainly contradicts it, *lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other mens sins.* In case *Timothy* had had that power to have conferred with the calling, qualifications for the calling, he had no need to have been in that way advised, to use such circumspection. Why should he be so careful to see them first fit, in case his laying on of hands would fit them? There need not such trial whether they were gifted in case a touch of the hand would be the gifting of them. And for *Timothies* Ordination in the place quoted, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. it followes not from our grant; that extraordinary gifts are there specified, that authority for the Ministerial work is denied. It is plain that *Moses* authorized *Joshua*, for succession in his place; by laying on of hands, *Deut.* 34. 9. The people upon that took him for his successor, yet it is as plain in the Text, that the Spirit of wisdom was then conferred upon him. Authority and power are sometimes given at once, yet all that are in power to authorize, cannot impower for this businesse, he that will see more, may read Dr. *Seamans Treatise* on this subject, and *jus divinum Ministerii Ecclesiastici.*

An Objection answered.

CHAP. XXIX.

Miniſters of Chriſt muſt bring their people up to the termes of the Covenant, preſſing the neceſſity of Faith and Repentance.

THen it farther yet follows; that the Miniſters of Chriſt are to call their people unto theſe duties, before mentioned as conditions. They muſt urge and preſſe the neceſſity of Faith and Repentance. Theſe are the termes of the covenant, and ſtipulation, to which God in covenant doth engage, in which the Apoſtles of Chriſt ſpent their paines, *Teſtifying both to Jews and Gentiles, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, Acts 20. 21. And this muſt be the buſineſſe of thoſe that make it their buſineſſe to preach the Goſpel in all ages. Men muſt be taught to obſerve what Chriſt commands and teaches, *Matth.* 28. 20. Theſe Chriſt teaches, and gives in charge; Thus he begun his Miniſtery, *Mark* 1. 15. *Repent ye, and beleeve the Goſpel.* They muſt ſo preach that men may not periſh; that they may not be the ſavour of death, But they only that beleeve, ſhall not periſh, *John* 3. 16. They that repent not, muſt periſh, *Luke* 13. 1. They muſt ſo preach Chriſt, that men may have their intereſt in Chriſt, that they may not be caſt off by Chriſt. But Faith gives this intereſt; *He dwells in our hearts by Faith*, Epheſ. 3. 17. Workers of iniquity muſt be caſt off, *Mat.* 7. 23. *Depart from me all ye that work iniquity.* It is no plain dealing in any of the Miniſters of Chriſt to make tender of promiſes, to hold forth priviledges, and conceale the termes, upon which they may be obtained; to ſpeak of ſalvation to men in ſinne, without ſo much as the name of ſanctification, or application to God in a way of Repentance; to tell men in the Prodigals courſe, of the Fathers bowels, and readineſſe to meet them with kiſſes; without mention of the Prodigals humiliation or coming in, to tell them of the *many ſinnes* forgiven to the woman in the Goſpel, *Luke* 7. 47. without once mention of thoſe many tears, that were ſhed in evidence of her repentance. They ſay, that theſe are the ſtrongeſt motives to work men from ſin. This I gladly yeeld when the

An Objection anſwered.

pro-

promiſe is tendered, and with it repentance urged. I know it was the way of the Prophet, *Eſay* 55. 7. and therefore a prevalent way; *Let the wicked forſake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him returne unto the Lord, and he will have mercy on him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.* The way alſo of the Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. *Be ye ſeparate, ſaith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you.* But the ſevering of the promiſe from the duty, ſo that Chriſt is heard only in a promiſe, not at all in a precept, when they heare that Chriſt will ſave; but are never told that they muſt repent. Theſe are but deluſions; Promiſe-Preachers, and no duty-Preachers; grace-Preachers, and not repentance-Preachers, do but (as the Apoſtle hath long ſince given warning) deceive with *vain words*, Epheſ. 5. 6. This will never work men from ſinne, but ſtrengthen men in ſin, *Ezek.* 13. 22. *Becauſe with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous ſad, whom I have not made ſad, and ſtrengthened the hands of the wicked, that he ſhould not returne from his wicked way, by promiſing life.* Theſe promiſes of life thus tendered, we ſee are lies, for men in ſinne, are men for death, *Ezek.* 18. 31. Theſe promiſes, ſtrengthen the hands of men in ſinne that they return not from it. It is the obſervation of many, that the falſe Prophets ſo branded in the Old Teſtament, vented no errours in Faith, but only miſapplications of truths. They promiſed peace, where the Lord had promiſed no peace; and therefore a *falſe Prophet* among the Jews is diſtinguiſhed from *a falſe Teacher* among Chriſtians, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. Theſe latter *bring in damnable hereſies*, and ſo did not the former; But as ours outſtrip them, in that they bring in errours in faith, ſo they joyne with them in miſapplications of truths. *If thou be a whoremonger, a blaſphemer, a drunkard, a mad man in iniquity* (ſaith one, or words to that purpoſe) *and there be no manner of change wrought in thee, yet come and take Chriſt, &c.* Does any Goſpel-Text, ſpeak of ſuch a mans taking of Chriſt, without any manner of change wrought? Are not thoſe the enemies of Chriſt, that riſe in hoſtile rebellion? *Pſal* 68. 21. And while they deſpiſe him, can they receive him? We would not have ſuch a ſinner (if we can poſſibly imagine a great ſinner) kept from Chriſt Jeſus; but he muſt come in at the Goſpel-door, He muſt come in the way of his call, He muſt come to receive whole Chriſt in each function of his, He muſt come

The danger of ſevering the promiſe from the duty.

Whole Christ must be received, and all of his gifts embraced.

come for every gift, which Christ poures out, He must come for repentance from Christ, as a Prince, as well as remission of sins as a Saviour, *Acts* 5. 31. *God hath exalted him with his right hand to be a Prince, and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgivenesse of sinnes.* He must come by the way of Faith for forgivenesse, This both Prophets and Apostles, Old Testament and New Testament-Gospel calls for, *Acts* 10. 43. *To him give all the Prophets witnesse, that through his Name, whosoever beleeveth in him shall receive remission of sinnes.* They must come by repentance and conversion in order to forgivenesse, *Acts* 3 19. *Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.* I do not say that there is no promise in Scripture made to a wicked man, that is the greatest Gospel-paradox; But I say, they are not made good, to wicked persons. They are made to the wicked, made good, that is, performed, to the beleeving and penitent. To finde a promise made, and made good, that is, tendered and performed to a man unbeleeving, impenitent, is indeed a labour. One replying to this question, *What, if I have not those conditions in me, as to feel my self hungry, thirsty and heavy-laden?* answers, *If you finde not these or such conditions in you; then you are not to apply your self to those promises, that are made to such as have those conditions in them; But you are to seek out for other (and more suitable) promises, which are absolute and without condition.* It is worth asking where those suitable promises are to a man void of faith? For that before by the Authour was mentioned, or to a man impenient, and not so much as hungring after them, such a one I meane, that upon good grounds, is able to charge the want of these upon his soul, I am sure they are under heavy Scripture-woes, even Gospel-menaces, and can they at the same time be fitted to receive the mercy of a promise? Where are his promises that hungers and thirsts not, when Christ saith, *Wo to you that are full, for you shall hunger?* Where is his promise that mourns not, but goes on frolick in his way, When Christ saith, *Woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall weep and lament,* Luke 6.25. Where is the unbeleevers promise, when the Lord sayes, *He that beleeveth not, is condemned already; because he hath not beleeved in the name of the only begotten Son of God,* John 3.18. Where is the impenitent mans promise, when the *Psalmist* saith, *The wicked*

Promises are made to the wicked, made good only to the beleeving and penitent. Objections answered.

shall

shall be turned into hell, Psalme 9.17. and the Apostle, *That no unrighteous person shall enter into the Kingdome of heaven*, 1 Cor. 6.9. But instance is given, *Isa.* 43.25. *I am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own name sake.* But this is not the unbeleeving, the impenitent mans transgressions, they still stand on record, and the bond uncancelled. This excludes motives from us, not graces wrought in us, when God justifies a beleever, it's for his own name sake, or else he is a loser in his glory, when *he justifies those that beleeve in Jesus*, Rom. 3.26. and Faith gives not glory to God, as *Rom.* 4.20. but takes glory from him. As *Peter* said of the creeple that was cured; *His name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong*, Acts 3.16. So we may say of every sinner, justified and pardoned, *His Name, through faith in his Name*, hath acquit and freed him. When God pardons a penitent man, it is not for the merit of his returne that he pardons him; if this were so, *Peter* who is so zealous, to advance his name in the place quoted; had not presently urged; *Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord*, Acts 3.19. It is not for his honour to pardon any other. This is with him a rule which he will for ever follow, *Those that honour me, I will honour, and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed*, 1 Sam. 3.30. The same Authour saith, *Conditions and qualifications are mentioned in some prōmises*; and therefore we may safely inferre, are understood in all promises of life and salvation, unlesse God deny himself, He hath threatned death and condemnation against an unqualified man; namely the unbeleeving and impenitent; and therefore hath not promised them life and salvation. Beleeving penitent ones, have the promises of life to be made good to them, exclusively to all others. To lead the sinner to Christ for the gaining of the qualifications of grace in the way of his Ordinances, is to lead him right; He is the Authour of our faith, and he is a Prince to give repentance. But to perswade a sinner to look for life, in the want of all these, or to tell him of Assurance of life without sense of these, is to deceive him. That happy Doctrine of free grace, so timely abused, even as soon as clearly preached, is now no lesse abused; Then, inferences were made from it, for encouragement to abound in sin, *Rom.* 6.1. Now inferences are drawn to cry down duty, Righteousnesse imputed must overthrow righte-

righteousnesse inherent. The Apostle would not suffer the former; the Ministers of Christ must not bear the latter.

CHAP. XXX.

A people in covenant must come up to the termes of the covenant, being engaged to God, they must answer their engagements.

The evil of breach of Covenant with man.

HEnce farther follows, that all people in covenant must come up to the termes and propositions of the covenant, Entring covenant they must see that their hearts art upright in it. How do we aggravate their wickednesse, and hold in detestation all those persons that break covenant with men, that having past a promise, (especially having put upon it the sanction of an Oath) yet violate and transgresse it. These first involve themselves in the guilt of lying, which every where in Scripture is followed with judgements, an Art which they learne of the Devil, who is a liar, and the father of lies, *John* 8. 44. And therefore with him have their doome in the lake that burnes with fire and brimstome, *Revel.* 21. 8. Secondly, in the pollution of Gods Name, which we should have in fear and dread, *Deut.* 28 5, 8. Taking it in vaine, in falsehood, and deceit into their mouths, endeavouring to bring in that God, whom they pretend to serve; in whom is all their expectation, as a party in their falsehood, and ungodlinesse. This high crime is charged upon *Israel* in taking to themselves again those servants that according to covenant they had dismissed, *Jerem.* 34. 15, 16. *Ye turned and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his handmaid, whom he had set at liberty, at their pleasure to returne, and brought them into subjection to be unto you for servants and for handmaids*; Therein is the overthrow of all bonds of humane society, of all converse and commerce, whether in more publick, or private negotiations. Truth is the upholding, and perfidiousnesse is the bane and utter destruction of it. When Papists have maintained that *Faith*, or *covenant* is not to be kept with Hereticks; reformed Churches have concluded upon it, that there is no safety of any, league or in-

intercourſe of dealing with them. The example of *John Huſſe* is a ſufficient warning. Thoſe that hold no ſuch principles, yet being ſuch in their practiees; are equally dangerous. We look upon theſe, as given up to a very Spirit of Atheiſm, if not wholly in their judgements to deny a Deity, and to utter with their mouths that which the Pſalmiſts fooſe ſayes in his heart, yet utterly ſlighting his Sovereignty, and diſregarding his judgements. They have arrived at that dedolency that the Apoſtle mentions, *Epheſ.*4.19. and therefore rankt by him with the worſt of Heathens, *Rom.*1.31. and put into that black bill of ungodly perſons, that will be found in the laſt and moſt perillous times, 2*Tim.*3.3. How much more then will God and man have in deteſtation thoſe; that have entred covenant in an immediate way with God, for faith and obedience and to ſtand out in oppoſition to ſinne, and Satan, yet (making defection from God by ſinne and unbeliefe) ſtand up in rebellion againſt him. Is the dreadful Majeſty of the great God of no more regard, than to pretend to him, engage with him, and then ſtand up in hoſtility againſt him? Is there any thing ſo lovely, or honourable in ſin, to allure men to run upon the wrath of God, that they may welter in it? or any thing ſo unpleaſing in the wayes of God, that neither the dread of his name, nor the bliſſe held forth in promiſe, can perſwade to embrace them? A viler thing cannot be named, than a Chriſtian in ſinne, a Chriſtian in wayes of unbeliefe and wickedneſſe. Were the name of a Chriſtian off, and no covenant bonds engaging to the Lord; then there were no more than a creature in rebellion, and that were bad enough, the work of Gods hand to ſtrive with its Maker. But ſtanding veſted in this covenant-relation, honoured with this glorious Name, here is an addition of Hypocriſie, Apoſtaſie and defection. We hate none more than thoſe that are falſe to us; and we may well conclude that God hates none more than thoſe that are falſe to him, and therefore challenges his people, whether they have found any iniquity in him, *Jerem.*2.5. *What iniquity have your fathers found in me, that they are gone farre from me, and have walked after vanity, and are become vain?* A ſervant doth not uſe to quit one Maſter, and betake himſelf to another, but he gives ſome reaſon of his change. One that hath been engaged for the ways of God (as all are that are called by the Name of God, and dignified

Breach of Covenant with God, is a greater evil.

with the title of a Christian) would be hard put to it, to give a reason of his revolt from God. When God and vanity are set in competition, that God should be refused, and vanity chosen, when the fountaine of living waters, that never can be drawn dry, is left, and cisternes, broken cisternes chosen, that are alwayes running dry. How does the holy Ghost set out these, 2*Pet.*2.22. *The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.* Can the sow find no other place than filth? nor the dogge no other food than his vomit? A returne to sinne is more loathsome than these, and such are all the wayes of all men in sinne, of all of a Christian profession, that are seen in ungodly ways; Nothing so glorious as a Christian that holds to his principles, that answers in conversation to his profession, Nothing so inglorious as a Christian in sin. A Jew outwardly, and a Heathen inwardly, a face for God, and a heart for iniquity. When such as these came out of the holy land for *Babylon*, they, there said in way of reproach of their God, *These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of his land*, Ezek.36.20. Rom.2.24. Insomuch that God is put to it for his vindication, not to suffer them to carry their sin with impunity, *Ezek.*39.23,24. *And the heathen shall know, that the house of* Israel *went into captivity for their iniquity, because they trespassed against me; therefore hid I my face from them, and gave them into the hand of their enemies; so fell they all by the sword according to their uncleanesse, and according to their transgressions have I done unto them, and hid my face from them.* This falsehood in covenant draws present sufferings, National plagues: *I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of my covenant*, Levit. 26. 25. Every Christian Nation under sufferings, may sadly reflect upon all that they groan under, and say their iniquities have procured these things unto them.

It brings National plagues.

But this breach of covenant with God hath greater evils, even unto eternity following upon it; Men of sinne and unbelieſe, that lie in distrust and disobedience, can claime no interest in the grace and mercy of the covenant. God in covenant engages to Faith and Repentance, these as we have seen are his termes, when men come not up to them, they dis-interest themselves, and disengage God from any tye of conferring blisse and savation upon them. Their own folly and madnesse, puts a barre to their own happi-

It brings evil to eternity.

nesse

neſſe and glory. They cannot be ſelf-ſaviours, yet they will not go out of themſelves for ſalvation by another, when they have received the ſentence of death in themſelves, they will not come to Chriſt, that they may have life. He may worthily bear his own debt, that in pride of ſpirit, refuſes anothers bounty, Chriſt offers himſelf as a Surety in our ſtead, to make payment for us in his own perſon. The unbeleever will ſtand on his own bottome, and make pay out of his own ſtore, or periſh; Having heaven and hell ſet before them; the tender of the one, and the terrour of the other, quitting heaven and all the glory of it, and happineſſe in it; they make choice of that fire, that is prepared for the Devil and his Angels, covenant-breaking having the certaine doome of deſtruction faſtened upon it. Aſſurance of ſalvation cannot be gained, but in a way of covenant-keeping; yea, the conditions of the covenant are the baſis, and never failing bottome of our Evidence and Aſſurance. It is gathered thus: *He that beleeves and repents, ſhall be ſaved.* This is evidently laid down in Scriptures; A man void of ſaving faith, and impenitent, may give his aſſent to it. Then the ſoul is to aſſume to it ſelfe, *but I beleeve and repent, therefore I ſhall be ſaved.* Theſe two (as at large hath been ſhewn) are the conditions of the covenant; theſe we muſt finde wrought in our ſouls, or elſe all Evidence is wanting, and when theſe are concluded, an undeceiving intereſt in ſalvation follows.

No Aſſurance of happineſſe, but in performance of the termes of the Covenant.

There is a twofold work to be done on the ſoul that is in ſin in order to bring it to ſalvation; There is a third to be done for aſſurance of ſalvation.

The firſt work is to ſet the ſoul free from Hell, to deliver it from the ſentence of Death; to which by the rule of juſtice, man ſtands condemned. A man muſt be fetched out of priſon, before he can be for any preferment, or place of honour. This is done by the blood of Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 1. 7. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, according to the riches of his grace.* This is the price of our ranſom, *Being redeemed, not with corruptible things, as ſilver and gold, but with the precious blood of Chriſt,* 1 Pet. 1 18.

Secondly, to make a man meet for heaven, A man ſo vile as ſinne makes, is a man fit for nothing but hell, and muſt have a change wrought before he be meet for heaven. Upon this ground

the Apoſtle is ſo large, in returning praiſe for the *Coloſſians*: *Giving thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light*, Col. 1. 12. As alone, the blood of Chriſt ſets free from hell; ſo alone, the Spirit of Chriſt makes fit for heaven. This is done by a double work. 1. Of regeneration or firſt implantation of grace, which is called the birth of the Spirit, *John* 3. 5, 6. 2. By acting, improving, carrying on this work of grace; which is properly ſanctification, ſo that when the Spirit is gone thus farre, here is a certainty of the object. It is ſure, nothing more ſure than this; that a regenerate ſanctified man ſhall be ſaved. But here is more required for a certainty of the ſubject. Here is *certitudo de re*; but more is required to attaine *certitudinem de ſe*. If *Peter* do beleeve and repent, he ſhall be ſaved, is out of controverſie; But that *Peter* doth beleeve and repent, is not alwayes ſo ſoone diſcovered, And this is the Spirits work as the former It is not my buſineſſe now to hold out what is the Spirits whole office in concluding our Aſſurance, but to ſhew that the conditions of the covenant are the bottom ground, not of ſalvation, but of our evidence of intereſt in ſalvation. We muſt know that we do beleeve and repent, before we have aſſurance, and we muſt firſt beleeve and repent, before we know that we beleeve and repent. If before faith and repentance there can be no ſalvation; then before we know we beleeve and repent, we cannot be aſſured of ſalvation: But without faith and repentance there is no ſalvation, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that beleeveth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved; but he that beleeveth not, ſhall be damned.* Luke 13. 3. 5. *I tell you, nay, but except ye repent, ye ſhall all likewiſe periſh*; Therefore before we beleeve and repent, we cannot be aſſured of ſalvation. And how aſſurance can be gained without a practical ſyllogiſme, and how a ſyllogiſme can be framed with any other *medium*, than the conditions of the covenant, is above my underſtanding. Man is ſo far from abilities to conclude ſalvation, without faith and repentance, that he muſt conclude himſelf to be in faith, and that he doth repent, before he can conclude any intereſt in it. The covenant of God is the ground of our ſalvation; if that be waved, all is loſt, and we muſt make good our part in the Covenant, Grace muſt aſſiſt to anſwer what the covenant requires, or no ſalvation. How is it a covenant, if nothing be required? and why is it required, if it muſt

not

not be performed? To gather up assurance from the conditions of the covenant is a businesse of greater consequence, even the highest pitch of Christianity. It is a great work to beleeve and repent, a greater work to know that we savingly beleeve and repent. The work it selfe is difficult, no businesse of a lazy soul, but to know, that the work is aright done, is a greater difficulty; but that it must be gathered from the conditions, is easie to resolve. I know some finding the seal of the Spirit, and the witnesse of the Spirit mentioned in Scripture in order to assurance, will have the whole of the work of Assurance to be carryed on alone by the Spirit, and that all is done in us without us. They expect a secret whisper from God, that we are Gods, and no more. This witnesse, they say, must be heeded, and our faith and repentance in the work not at all regarded; But I would know of those if the Spirit be a seale; whether the soul doth not bear the impresse? and what this impresse is, but the graces of the Spirit? The Seale sealing, and the impresse made, fully answer one the other, Sometimes it may dimmely answer, where the wax or clay, (or whatsoever is sealed) takes not a full impression; but if it answer not, it is no Seale. The graces that the Spirit works, are its impresse, and these are the conditions of the covenant, and so instead of an objection, we have a proofe. For the witnesse of the Spirit, I desire to know whether it be a single witnesse, giving testimony to us without us, or a witnesse concurring with our spirits? The Text is cleare, *Rom.* 8. 16. *The Spirit it self beareth witnesse with our spirits, that we are the children of God.* Our spirits bearing witnesse, are our consciences, *Rom.* 2. 5. *Their consciences also bearing them witnesse*; and therefore Master *Baxter* rightly affirmes, *That the testimony of the Spirit, and the testimony of our consciences are two concurrent testimonies, or causes, to produce one and the same effect.* But every conscience cannot witnesse thus with the Spirit, or joyne in a concurrent testimony. It *is the witnesse of a good conscience*, 1 Pet. 3. 21. *Baptisme saves* (saith the Apostle) *by the resurrection of Christ*; Explaining himself, *not the putting away the filth of the flesh*, not the bare outward act of administration (which is worthily set out by the most undervaluing termes, when it is put in opposition to the inward work) *but the answer of a good conscience towards God.* Baptisme

The office of the Spirit in the work of Assurance.

ptiſme is a ſeal of the covenant, and it engages to what the covenant requires; which (as we have been ſtill catechized) *is to beleeve in God, and to forſake our ſins*, and when conſcience anſwers that this is done, Baptiſme is a ſeale that Chriſt ſaves. The ſeale of the Spirit is an impreſſe of thoſe graces; and the witneſſe of the Spirit is a clearingup of theſe graces, and giving in teſtimony to the truth of them, opening our eyes to read the characters, which it ſelfe hath made, 1 *Corinth.* 2. 12. *We have not received the ſpirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.* So that in vaine do men talk of the Spirit; that have not on their own hearts the impreſſe of it, or of the witneſſe of the Spirit, when a renewed conſcience cannot concurre, in teſtimony that theſe engagements are anſwered in faith and repentance; let that Text of the Apoſtle be conſidered, 1 *John* 3. 24. *He that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him; and hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.* I know there are ſome that admit of all this, and freely yeeld, that this is a ſafe way to conclude Aſſurance from Sanctification, Confeſſing that the Spirit never witneſſeth with an unſanctified heart, yet they contend for a farther and immediate teſte of the Spirit, without any conſideration had, of inherent graces wrought, or any reflection made, by the the ſoule upon it ſelfe, in review of any gracious qualifications. Yet here they confeſſe danger; and limit this doctrine of theirs with diverſe cautions, as I have met with ſome, from an eminent hand, in a manuſcript. 1. *This is extraordinary* (as they ſay) *very ſeldome ſeene or known, it is no common way of the Spirits witneſſe.* 2. *It is for the moſt part in, or upon performance of ſome duties, or conſcientious employment of a mans ſelfe in the way of his calling.* 3. *After ſome great abaſement of a mans ſpirit, and more than ordinary ſoul-humiliations and ſelf-denials.* 4. *After ſome great adventures made for God, and the advancement of his Name.* 5. *After ſome great combate, and conflict with temptation, in which God gives in his Spirit, as an* honorarium, *or glorious reward upon victory obtained.* 1. Firſt, by way of conceſſion, it is not to be denied, that God in a more than ordinary meaſure, doth many times manifeſt the gift of his Spirit

The immediate teſte of the Spirits examined.

fit for this work of Assurance, and that upon these occasions here laid down, the soule hath many cheering consolations nigh unto raptures. The Spouse hath not like converse with the Bridegroome at all times; Sometimes she *walks with him in the Galleries*; Sometimes she *is with him in the wine-sellers*; Sometimes she can say in a way of exultation, *My beloved is mine, and I am his.* But these limits in the instances before laid down, seem to me to be a full denial, instead of proof, that it is thus immediate, without all reflex upon our graces. These being means sanctified of God, to stir up the habit of grace by his Spirit wrought within us, and to bring them forth into action, which God then farther honours with a greater measure of light, to discerne his own work wrought in us. Our spirits being got into such a posture, are in an aptitude to witnesse with us; and God is then pleased, to come in by his Spirit, to joyn in Evidence; So that still the conditional promises, are not only a safe, but the alone way, in which through the help of the Spirit we get Assurance that we shall be saved. They that go about to assert an immediate teste, will never secure the soule from delusion, Satan will soon finde an artifice, to counterfeit this testimony, and bear witnesse, in the Spirits stead, and when we think we have the Spirit of truth to assure, we shall have the father of lies to deceive. A gappe will be opened to all licentious presumption, *Children of disobedience* will soone heed *vain words, that the wrath of God shall not come upon them*; Neither will it be to purpose to demand, how the Prophets were assured that it was the word of the Lord that came to them, and no delusion, and to affirme that the same way we have assurance of the truth of the Spirits witnesse, seeing Gods extraordinary way of discovery of himself in visions, dreams, or what other way himself pleased to chuse, is not the same with his ordinary way of discovery unto us, we no more understand that way of discovery than we do the way in which by power received, they wrought miracles. As for Doctrines, which men are apt to obtrude upon the Spirit; so, for testimonies, in order to our adoption and salvation, we must go *to the Law, and to the Testimony.* The Law and Testimony lead us, for Assurance to our own hearts, excusing or condemning in the particulars mentioned; *And if our hearts condemne us not, then have we confidence towards God; and whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments.*

Object

mandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight. And this is his Commandment, that we should beleeve on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another as he gave us commandment, 1 *John* 3. 21, 22, 23. And if the stresse of all had not lien here, Christ had never compared the Professor, that hears and does not, to the foolish builder that raises his hopes of salvation on a sandy foundation, upon a bare title of an empty profession, without any well grounded interest, and the Professor that heares and does, to the man that builds on a rock, and so layes his hopes of salvation on a foundation, that never will deceive: Neither would the Psalmist have concluded that, *he shall not be ashamed*, (his hope would not make him ashamed) *when he had respect unto all Gods Commandments*, Psalme 119. 6. And howsoever our doing does nothing by way of merit; yet our doing through grace (in which beleeving is comprized, which is the command of God, 1 *John* 3. 23.) does all; taking in the Spirits help to cleare the integrity of these works, by way of Assurance. And though it be no foundation of our subsistence in grace; and therefore the Apostle durst not rest on that bottome, nor will be found in his own righteousnesse; yet it is the foundation of our evidence. The Apostle gives it in command to *Timothy*, *Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded, nor trust in uncertaine riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate*, giving this in as the end of all, *Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life*, 1 Tim. 6. 17, 18, 19. God hath *ordained these, that we should walk in them*, Ephes. 2. 10. and walking in them; we are pronounced blessed, *Psalme* 119. 1, 2. The efficient cause of our happinesse is grace, the free favour and good will of God towards man, *Being justified freely by his grace*, Rom. 3. 24. The formal cause, is, the imputation of Christs righteousnesse without ours, when we fall short of the righteousnesse of the Law; *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnesse*, Rom. 10. 3. Therefore the Apostle observes, that *David describes the blessednesse of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousnesse without works*, (that is, wherein his blessednesse doth consist,) *saying*,

Blessed

Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe ſinnes are covered; Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute ſin, Rom. 4.6,7,8. The inſtrument or hand applying, is Faith: *Being juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt, whom God hath ſet forth for propitiation through faith in his blood*, *Rom.* 3.24,25. But the ſubject on whom this bleſſedneſſe reſts, is the godly righteous man: *The Lord hath ſet apart him that is godly for himſelf*, Pſalme 4. 3. *The man that hath clean hands, and a pure heart, who hath not lift up his ſoul unto vanity, nor ſworne deceitfully; he ſhall receive the bleſſing from the Lord, and righteouſneſs from the God of his ſalvation*, Pſal. 24.4,5. There is a concurrence of ſundry cauſes in mans happineſſe, but all falls upon the head of him that is ſtedfaſt with God in covenant, that comes up to the termes and conditions of it. He is pronounced, and ſhall remaine for ever bleſſed, *and without holineſſe no man ſhall ſee the Lord.* It is queſtioned by ſome, whether it be the truth, or the degree of theſe graces, which are conditions of the Goſpel covenant, upon performance of which we may conclude our Aſſurance of happineſſe; but the determination of that (being thus put) is eaſie, No man in true grace ſhall go to hell, or miſſe of heaven, God doth not adorne man with that glory to reject him. The Apoſtle exhorts *to love, not in word, nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth*; and for a motive, adds; *Hereby we know that we are of the truth, and ſhall aſſure our hearts before him*, 1 Joh. 3.18,19. But the *minimum quod ſic*, when it is that grace may be accounted true, is not ſo eaſie, to determine. It is not every faintiſh deſire that is the work on which all this glory reſts. It muſt be a work of farther power and efficacy on the ſoul, for ſatisfaction of which I ſhall referre the Reader to the learned labours of my much honoured neighbour, Maſter *Anthony Burgeſſe* in his ſpiritual refining.

CHAP. XXXI.

The distribution of the Covenant of Grace into the Old and New Covenant with the harmony and agreement that is found between them.

BY Gods assistance we have been thus farre carried on in the work in hand, to finde out the nature of a covenant, and Gods way of entring covenant with man. And for the more clear discovery of both, we have held forth the agreement which is found, between the covenant of Works, which God entred with man in his state of integrity; and the covenant of Grace entred of God with man, in his fallen condition, as also their respective differences, So that all that is essential in this covenant, (and necessarily required to the attainment of the priviledges and mercies promised in it) hath been made known, and a compleat definition given, with such corolaries and inferences that have been judged necessary.

The Old and New Covenant

Now this covenant thus entred with man in his lapsed estate, and hitherto cleared, admits of distinction; and is distinguished in Scripture by the names of the *Old* and *New Covenant*, Heb. 8. 13. *The first and second covenant*, Heb. 8. 7. The first some call, and not unfitly, a covenant of Promise; under that covenant Christ was known in promises only, and not manifested in the flesh; Others call it a subservient covenant, being to lead in the second in its full lustre and glory, which alone they call a covenant of Grace, and make it a third covenant But I shall content my self with the Scripture-termes, calling the first, *Old*, not because it was first in being, but because it is to be abolished, and another to succeed, the later *New*, because it is never to be antiquated, as the Apostle, *Heb.* 8. 13. explains himself. Now, it must needs contribute much to the clear understanding of the covenant; as well of the termes of it, as the mercies in it, and be a great advantage for the better understanding of sundry, both Old and New Testament-Scripture; in case the agreement between this Old and New covenant, together with their true differences be rightly assigned, and those imaginary differences assigned by some (erroneous on either hand

to

to the great prejudice of either of the covenants) be throughly examined. A work of difficulty, but (were it well followed) of singular profit. On this by the help of Gods grace I shall adventure, and in the first place lay down their agreement, afterwards their respective true and real differences, and then proceed to examination of such differences which some have assigned, which I reserve to the last place, seeing in the two first I shall be brief. The last will be found a businesse full of tedious difficulty, and trouble. In several things there is a full agreement between these covenants.

The method followed in the ensuing part of the Treatise.

Agreement between the Old and New covenant in six particulars.

1. *In the Authour propounding*, God is the Authour of them both; God is *the God, not of the Jews only,* (who were in the first covenant) *but of the Gentiles also*, taken through grace into the second covenant, *Rom.* 3. 29.

2. *In the party accepting*, as specifically considered, they are both entred with man; Neither Angels, nor any other creature articles, or is articled with in it; and hitherto there is an agreement of both with the covenant of works.

3. *In the motive or impulsive cause*; Both of these are of singular grace, entred with fallen man in his lost condition; there was no hint of this grace before the fall, nor any need, or use of it, being not for mans preservation, but his restitution.

4. *In the Mediatour Christ Jesus*, who was one and the same in both: For though *Moses* have the name of Mediatour, *Gal.* 3 19. *Receiving the lively oracles, and giving them to the people,* Acts 17.38. as the Judges in *Israel* had the name of *Saviours*, *Nehem.* 9.27. and thereupon *Camero* makes this difference between the Old and the New covenant, *That Moses was Mediatour in one, Christ in the other*, Thes. 68. yet he confesses, that *that mediation, by the benefit whereof men are truly and effectually united to God, belongs only unto Christ. De trip. fœdere. Thes. Moses* work was only to deliver the way of the worship of God in those times, and that not in his own name, but *as a servant*, *Heb.* 3.5. He that *Moses* did serve, of whom he wrote, *Joh.* 5. 46. that Prophet like unto *Moses*, whom God promised to raise, *Deut.* 18.15. in all ages was Mediatour.

5. They agree *in the conditions annext.* Both these covenants have one, and the same conditions, on Gods part, Remission of sins, and everlasting happinesse, as after shall be shewed more fully;

They are the ſame on mans part, Faith and Repentance. *The juſt then did live by faith*, Heb. 2. 4. *And without faith it was then impoſſible to pleaſe God*, Heb. 11. 6. Acts 10. 43. *To him give all the Prophets witneſſe, that through his name, whoſoever beleeveth in him ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins.* God then called for returne to himſelf, and ſincerity in our returnes, accepting thoſe that were ſincere, *Ezek.* 18. 31. *The eyes of the Lord run to and fro through the whole earth, to ſhew himſelf ſtrong in the behalf of thoſe whoſe hearts are perfect before him*, 2 Chron 26. 9.

6. *They agree in the unity of Church-fellowſhip, conſtituting one and the ſame Church of Chriſt.* The Church in thoſe dayes in which the Fathers lived, is one and the ſame Church with this in Goſpel-times. In Goſpel-times men come from the Eaſt, and Weſt, and ſit down with *Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob in the Kingdome of heaven*, Matth. 8. 11. One and the ſame Kingdome receives both. Their Faith was terminated upon Chriſt as well as ours; *Abraham ſaw his day and rejoyced*, John 8. 56. *Moſes* bore his reproach, *and eſteemed it greater then the treaſures in Egypt*, Heb. 11. 26. *They did eat the ſame ſpiritual meat, and did drink the ſame ſpiritual drink; they drank of the Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 10. 3. The ſame, not among themſelves, but the ſame with us. They are ſaved by the ſame free grace and mercy as we; *Jews by nature*, are juſtified by the ſame faith in Jeſus, *as ſinners of the Gentiles*, Gal. 2. 15, 16. All theſe identities evidence one and the ſame Church, ours and theirs; *Therefore ſay I unto you, the Kingdome of God ſhall be taken from you, and given to a Nation bringing forth the fruits thereof*, Matth. 21. 43. The ſame Kingdom was taken from them and given to us, was taken from the Jewes, and given to the Gentiles; where *Sem* left, there *Japhet* took poſſeſſion, *Gen.* 9. 27. *Sems* Tents are *Japhets*. Theſe ſpeak the covenants, into which we have ſucceſſively entred, to be one and the ſame in ſubſtance. A covenant entred by the ſame parties, upon the ſame termes and propoſitions on either hand, is the ſame covenant; Such is the Old covenant entred with the Jewes, and the New covenant entred with Chriſtians, they are therefore one and the ſame in ſubſtance.

The Old and New Covenant in ſubſtance one.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXII.

Differences assigned between the Old and New covenant.

THese covenants, are not in that manner, fully and entirely one, but there is difference in the way of administration. They are one in substance, constituting one Church, one Kingdome; but different in circumstances. Upon which account, they are distinguished, by the names of the *Old and New*, *the first and second Covenant.* Some have made it their ambition to rise as high as may be, in the number of differences, and have assigned several, where there is a full accord and perfect agreement: I shall lay down such where the difference is clear; and afterward take view, of those imaginary differences upon which any controversie of moment hangs.

Differences between the Old and New Covenant.

1. They differ *in the agents employed, in administration of these respective covenants entred of God, and upheld and continued with his people.* The Old covenant was administred and held forth by Servants only, Prophets, Priests, and such as God pleased to appoint, whether by ordinary call, as those of the Tribe of *Levi*, *who were appointed among men in things appertaining to God.* Or, extraordinary, to whom he spake in visions and dreams; *God in sundry wayes and manners* (as the Apostle to the Hebrews observes) *then speaking to his people*, Heb. 1. 1. The New covenant is held forth by the Son, as in the same place the Apostle witnesseth. He was the Angel or Messenger of the covenant, Upon that errand he came from the Father, clothed with our flesh. This is *that great salvation, which first began to be spoken to us by the Lord*, Heb. 2. 3. And this he carries on, by his delegates and deputies, whom from the right hand of the Father he gifts and qualifies.

2. They differ *in their extent and latitude, as to the Nations taken into covenant.* The Old covenant received only the Jews; To them appertained *the Adoption, the Glory, and the Covenants*, Rom. 9. 4. Circumcision, the Seale of the covenant, was proper to them, with some few of other Nations, that forgetting their own people, and their fathers house, joyned themseves to them, whilest

whileſt other Nations were known by the name of uncircumciſion being without title to that Seale; and were *without Chriſt, aliens to the common-wealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the covenant of Promiſe*, Eph. 2. 12. Therefore the Apoſtles, before the vaile was taken away, had that reſtraint upon them, *Matth.* 10. 5. *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not.* The loſt ſheep of the houſe of *Iſrael* (being in covenant) onely were in their commiſſion. That was a *valley of viſion*, All other people were in darkneſſe. They *were a people of God*, Others were *no people*. The New covenant takes in all Nations, reſpective to the covenant, no Nation hath any barre put to it, *but in every Nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteouſneſſe, is accepted with him*, Act. 10. 35. Chriſt having taken away the partition wall; the Apoſtles have a commiſſion for the diſcipling of all Nations, ſo that in *Chriſt Jeſus, There is neither Jew nor Greek, Scythian nor Barbarian*, Col. 3. 11.

3. They differ *in their duration or continuance.* The Old covenant had but its date of time, which being expired, it muſt give way for the New to ſucceed. Thus the Apoſtle reaſons from the Prophets prediction, of a New covenant, *Heb.* 8. 13. *In that he ſaith, A New covenant, he hath made void the Old; now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vaniſh away.* This was to ſtand *till times of reformation*, Heb. 9 10. This ſecond covenant muſt remaine till the end of time. Theſe are called the laſt dayes, in that, after theſe there muſt be no change of Ordinances. The Miniſtery now eſtabliſhed, is to remaine to the end of the world, *Matth.* 28. 20. and the Sacraments, until Chriſts ſecond coming unto judgement.

4. They differ *in the way of dedication or conſecration.* The Old covenant was dedicated, and purified with the blood of Bulls and Goats, and other Sacrifices, which according to the Law were ſlaine and offered, as the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* obſerves from *Exod.* 24. 7, 8. *Heb.* 9. 19, 20, 21. *When* Moſes *had ſpoken every precept to all the people according to the Law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water and Scarlet-wool and hyſope, and ſprinkled both the book and all the people; ſaying, This is the blood of the Teſtament which God hath enjoyned you. Moreover, he ſprinkled with blood both the Tabernacle and all the veſſels of the Miniſtery.* But in the New Teſtament, the dedication is in the blood of Chriſt.

This

This is my blood in the New Testament shed for you, and for many for the remission of sins: Where we see, 1. An agreement, Either of both are Testaments and covenants, Either of both have their dedication, Either of both are dedicated in blood; 2. An answerable difference and opposition. The first was the Old Testament to be antiquated. The second the New, to succeed in place of the Old. The first was dedicated in the blood of Bulls and Calves. The second in the blood of the Mediatour; *in my blood,* saith Christ. The first had no possible power to take away sinne, as the Apostle presently shews, *chap.* 10. 4. *But this is shed for many for the remission of sins.* The Apostle in the words immediately before these quoted, gives the covenant the name of a Testament, though a covenant, and a mans last Will and Testament really differ, seeing herein they agree, that the covenant had its validility, as a Testament, by the death of him that made the covenant, *Heb.* 9. 16, 17.

5. They differ *in the way of exhibition of Christ, the glory and grace of the covenant*, And upon a threefold account here, there is a difference. 1. In the Old covenant we have Christ only in a Promise; to be incarnate, to suffer, and to rise again, and to be received unto glory. Under that covenant, light was by way of prophecie; In the New covenant he is evidently set forth as come in the flesh; Having been dead and now alive, *Rev.* 1. 18. Having suffered in the flesh, risen again and entred into glory. To us, it is not a prophecie, but a Gospel. 2. In the Old covenant, all was held out to the people under types, figures, shadows; All about the Tabernacle and Temple, Persons, Utensils, Sacrifices, did lead to Christ; all of these, darkly holding him forth. *They had a shadow of good things to come, and not the image of the things themselves*, Heb. 10. 1. a little of reality in a great bulk of ceremony. In the New Testament, the truth of it, is clearly, and manifestly (without figure or type) held forth unto us. 3. In the Old Testament, knowledge was dim and obscure. It could be no other, when it was wrapt up in prophecies and types. A prophecie is a riddle till it be unfolden, and little is known of a man by his shadow, comparative to that which is seen in the man himselfe. Therefore though the state of the Jewes in Old Testament-times was a state of light, comparative to the darkneſse that was with other people, and their land was called

The Jews were in a state of light comparative to Heathens.
In a state of darkness comparative to Christians.

a

a valley of visions, Isa. 22.1. yet it was little more than darkneſſe, comparative to that light which in Goſpel times is revealed. Christ was a Miniſter of circumciſion, and when he began his Miniſtery in the land of *Zebulon* and *Nephali*; the Text ſays, *The people that ſate in darkneſſe ſaw a great light*, Mat. 4.16. Circumciſion therfore, in different reſpects, was both a Priviledge, and a Bondage, A Priviledge, *Rom.* 3.1. It was a great mercy to have light let in at any crevice, promiſes any way ſealed and ratified to us. A Bondage, *Acts* 15.10. To live in ſo dim a light, and to be laden in ſo burdenſome a way, was a heavy yoke; So that, as the Apoſtle putting the queſtion, *What advantage the Jew had, and what priviledge there was of circumciſion*, above and before the Gentile? *Rom.* 3.1. anſwers, *Much every way*, and gives in his reaſon of the preheminence; So, in caſe the queſtion ſhould be put *What advantage hath the Chriſtian, and what priviledge there is of Baptiſme*, above and before the Jew? Anſwer may be made, Much every way, and the reaſon given of the preheminence in Goſpel-times, in the particulars above mentioned; So that, the New covenant, *is a better covenant, eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes*, Heb. 8.6. Promiſes are more full and clear. Though it muſt be confeſt, that a Chriſtians preheminence above the Iewes, doth not equal a Iewes preheminence above the Gentile. The Iew was in covenant with God, and was heire of the Promiſe. *The Gentiles were aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael, ſtrangers from the covenant of Promiſe; having no hope, and without God in the world*, Epheſ. 2.12. The Iew was in the ſame covenant in his time, as Chriſtians are in Goſpel-times. There is not a promiſe in the New covenant, whether it be for priviledges, conferred upon us, or graces wrought in us, but by the help of that light, we may finde in the Old covenant, the ſame held out, as after will be more clearly manifeſted. The betterneſſe is, in the greater eaſe being freed from that bondage, of the ceremonial yoke, and in their more diſtinct clearneſſe. The glory of all, that the covenant doth tender, being in ſo clear, and full a way held out in Goſpel-times, *that he that is leaſt in the Kingdom of God*, under the glory of the New Teſtament-revelation, *is greater* in the way of Goſpel-Myſteries, *then John Baptiſt*, who was the greateſt of Prophets, greater than a Prophet. Thoſe Prophets that did foreſee, and foreſhew the Birth, Life, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion of Chriſt, the

the triumphant conqueſt of his enemies, his glory at the right hand of his Father, the ſpreading of the Goſpel, the call of the Gentiles, did not themſelves ſee it; as now the meaneſt that are in Chriſt do underſtand it, no more than they who now preach through Chriſt the Reſurrection of the dead, the everlaſting bliſſe of glorified Saints, in their eternal fruition of Gods preſence, are able to underſtand it in that meaſure, as the meaneſt that then ſhall have the happineſſe to enjoy it.

6. They differ *in the Seales annext for either of their ratification and confirmation*; for howſoever they are of the ſame uſe, leading to one, and the ſame thing ſignified, the Jewes had Chriſt in their Sacraments, 1 *Cor.* 10.4. 1 *Cor.* 5.7. and we have no more in ours; yet they differ in the outward ſtamp or *effigies*, as I may ſo ſpeak, as well that, of initiation, as that of corroboration. The initiating Sacrament of the Jewes (which gave them the denomination of the people of God) was that painful circumciſion in the fleſh, *ſignum vile, & incivile*, yet, thoſe that would be the Lords, did, and muſt ſubmit unto it. All of *Abrahams* ſeed with him, received that ſigne; And all of thoſe, that with him would joyne unto the Lord. This was to be the leading Sacrament; He that was not circumciſed in the fleſh, might not eat of the Paſſeover, *Exod* 12.48. *And when a ſtranger ſhall ſojourne with thee, and will keep the Paſſeover unto the Lord, let all his males be circumciſed, and then let him come neer and keep it; and he ſhall be as one that is borne in the land, for no uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eat thereof.* A full Text againſt all that plead for unbaptized perſons admiſſion to the Lords Table, God will not ſuffer that diſorder, that the leading Sacrament ſhould come after. The initiating Sacrament with Chriſtians is that of Baptiſme, no ſooner was a man brought into covenant, but he was ſtreight baptized; aſſoon as he made profeſſion, he had this ſealing engaging ſigne, the application of water, which is of an abſterſive cleanſing nature, implying our ſtaine and guilt, and leading us thither, where purification and freedome is found, the Spirit and blood of Jeſus Chriſt. The following Sacrament in the Old covenant, was that of the Paſſeover; a Lamb without blemiſh to be eaten in the place and way that God preſcribed. That in the New Teſtament, is the Supper of the Lord, in ordinary, common, uſeful, and neceſſary elements, Bread and Wine, which are of a ſtrengthning &

cheering nature, *Pſ.*104.15. Implying our fainting, feeble eſtate, our diſconſolate and ſad condition, and leading us, where we may find both ſtrength and conſolation.

CHAP. XXXIII.

Poſitions tending to clear the firſt covenant, under Old Teſtament-diſpenſations.

BEfore I proceed to the examination of thoſe ſuppoſed differences; which ſome have brought in, to the prejudice of both covenants; I ſhall lay down certain poſitions, to give ſome light for the more clear underſtanding, eſpecially of the Old covenant, and to help us (if it may be) in our judgements of them both; as well in their agreement, as their ſeverall differences.

Moſes delivered a Covenant from God to *Iſrael* in Mount *Sinai.*

First Poſition, *God delivered unto* Adam *in Paradiſe, not only a Law or Rule of life, but alſo a Covenant, (as was before ſhewed;) So,* Moſes *in Mount* Sinai *delivered unto the people of the Jews, not a Law or rule only, but a covenant likewiſe.* This might be confirmed at large, but that others have fully done it; and I know not that there is any adverſary that appears in it. The name of a covenant is frequently given to it, *Deut.* 4. 13. *He declared unto you the covenant, which he commanded you to performe, even ten Commandments.* See 2 *Kings* 18. 12. 2 *Chron.*6.11. All the eſſentials of a covenant before mentioned, Parties, Conſent, Conditions, are found in it, as we may ſee in that one Text, *Deut.*26. 17,18. *Thou haſt avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, to walk in his wayes, and the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promiſed thee.* Yea, the ſolemnities of a covenant, as before hath been largely ſhewne, are found in it.

Moſes delivered a Covtnant of Grace to *Iſrael*

Secondly, *This covenant delivered by* Moſes *to the people of* Iſrael, *was a covenant of Grace, the ſame in ſubſtance with this, under which, we live in Goſpel-times.* This is ſo largely proved to my hand by Maſter *Ball* in his *Treatiſe of the covenant*, page 102, 103, 104. and Maſter *Burges* in his *Vindiciæ legis*, page 224, 225.

that

that I may ſpare my paines; yet in brief, That covenant which teacheth Chriſt, in which men attaine ſalvation, that accepts men upon repentance, in which there is pardon of ſinne, and in which the heart is circumciſed of God; that is a covenant of grace. One of theſe ſingle will evince it, much more in their joynt ſtrength will they conclude it; But the covenant delivered by *Moſes*, was ſuch a covenant. In that covenant Chriſt was taught, *John* 5.46,47. *Had ye beleved* Moſes, *ye would have beleeved me; but if ye beleeve not* Moſes, *how will ye beleeve my words?* Whence the collection is plaine, Beleevers of *Moſes*, are Beleevers of *Chriſt*; and Rejecters of *Moſes*, are Rejecters of *Chriſt*: See *Luke* 24.25, 26. *with* 44, 45, 46. *John* 1.45. *Acts* 26.22, 23. *Rom.* 3.21, 22. The Prophecies, Promiſes, Types, Genealogies, Sacraments under that covenant (whether ordinary or extraordinary) all held forth Chriſt as might be eaſily ſhewn in their ſeveral particulars. In that covenant the people of the Jews attained ſalvation, and were not only fed with temporal Promiſes, and a covenant meerly carnal; not looking above or beyond the land of *Canaan*, as ſhall be ſhewen: In this covenant men are accepted, and received into mercy and favour upon repentance; *When thou art in tribulation, and all theſe things are come upon thee in the later dayes, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and ſhalt be obedient to his voice, (for the Lord thy God is a merciful God) he will not forſake thee, neither deſtroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he ſware unto them*, Deut. 4.30,31. In this covenant there is pardon of ſinne, (the great priviledge of the New covenant, *Heb.* 8. 12.) The Lord proclaimes himſelf to *Moſes*; *The Lord, the Lord God, merciful, and gracious, long-ſuffering, and abundant in goodneſſe and truth, keeping mercy for thouſands, forgiving iniquity, tranſgreſſion and ſin*, Exod. 34.6,7. See Exod. 32.31,32. 2 Chron. 7.14 Pſal. 25.11. Pſal. 51.12. 7.9.14. In this covenant the heart is circumciſed (another great priviledge of the New covenant, *Heb.* 8.) *And the Lord thy God will circumciſe thy heart, and the heart of thy ſeed, to love the Lord thy God.* All of theſe, any of theſe hold out a covenant of Grace.

The ten Commandments delivered by *Moſes* were of this Covenant of Grace.

Thirdly, the ten commandments, which are called the covenant of God, *Deut.* 4.13. 2 *Chron.* 6.11. (all that *Moſes* delivered to *Iſrael*, being there epitomized) holds forth a covenant

of Grace, and not of Works. This appears in the Preface, intimating Gods grace and goodneſſe to that people, *bringing them out of the land of Egypt, and the houſe of Bondage.* Which deliverance had more in it than a bare temporal mercy; otherwiſe their paſſage through the red Sea could have been no Baptiſme as the Apoſtle calls it, *1 Cor.* 10.1. Neither had it been any act of juſtifying faith in *Moſes* to obſerve the Paſſeover, which yet the Apoſtle obſerves, *Heb.* 11.28. Then their Rock and Manna had been a *viaticum* in the way, but no Sacrament. There God avoucheth himſelf to be the God of that people; *I am the Lord thy God*, and he was a God in covenant to none of man-kinde fallen, but by an act of grace. It appears in the firſt commandment, where God requires them to accept him, and cleave unto him, which cannot be done but through Chriſt. It appears in the ſecond commandment; in the preceptive part of it, which contains the whole ceremonial Law, in which, pardon of ſinne was found through Chriſt. Thither Interpreters reduce all the Sacrifices, Types, Sacraments of the Jewes. It appeares in the reaſons annext to that precept, which, as it threatens judgement on tranſgreſſours of the Law; ſo, mercy to thoſe that obſerve it. Mercy is an act of Grace, and not vouchſafed but in Chriſt. It appears in the fifth commandment, in the promiſe there annext, and faſtened to it; So that this covenant (or this ſumme or epitome of the covenant between God and his people) which was put into the Arke, and the Mercy-ſeat or propitiatory ſet upon it, in the moſt holy place, *Exod.* 26. 34. was a covenant of Grace.

Being a Covenant of Grace, it could by no means be a Covenant of Works.

Fourthly, this covenant (delivered by *Moſes* and epitomized in the Decalogue) being a covenant of Grace, it could by no meanes be, in the whole and entire nature of it, a covenant of Works. This is plaine, God doth not at once, with the ſame people enter covenant upon ſo oppoſite termes. Theſe are ἀντίθετα, either of them deſtructive to the other. We may argue concerning the covenant, as the Apoſtle doth concerning Election, *If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwiſe grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, otherwiſe work is no more work.* This I ſpeak as for their ſakes, that make it a mixt covenant, ſuch a one as *Pauls* adverſaries preacht in the Churches of *Galatia*; ſo alſo for their ſakes, that aſſert it to

be

be a covenant of Works, never undertaking any anſwer to thoſe arguments, which ſo clearly conclude it to be a covenant of Grace.

What this Covenant is to any, it is to all.

Fifthly, *What this covenant is to any, that it is to all, whether it be of works or of grace; what it is in it ſelfe in the tender and termes of it, that is the denomination of it.* This is plaine, Mens faith or unbelief, Mens obedience or tranſgreſſion, cannot diverſifie the nature of that which God doth tender; And what God ſpake to the people, he ſpake to all the people, the ſame to all, that he ſpake to any, *Exodus* 19. 25. *Exodus* 20. 18. compared, and therefore that is a miſtake in ſome that ſay, *That the Law is doubtleſſe a pure covenant of Works to ſome men, but not to all. It is a covenant of works, occaſionally and accidentally, and not only to thoſe which are not related to, comprehended in, or made partakers of the covenant of Grace.* He ſhould rather have ſaid, that the ten commandments had been a covenant of Grace, but ſometimes by an accident or eſpecial occaſion had become a covenant of Works, which yet could not have held. The covenant of Grace and the covenant of Works are two diſtinct and oppoſite *Species*, They have one and the ſame univocal *Genus*, of whoſe nature they equally partake. Therefore as an Oxe can by no occaſion or accident, be a Horſe, or a Horſe a Sheep, or a Sheep a Lion, or a Lion a man; ſo a covenant of Grace, can by no occaſion or accident be a covenant of Works; one and the ſame thing intended for one end, may occaſionally and accidentally have another event; as the Miniſtery intending ſalvation, may prove an aggravation of condemnation; but no occaſion or accident can change the nature of any thing, into that which is of a kind oppoſite to it, and different from it. And in ſuch caſes where the event is hindred, and another happens; the denomination is, and muſt be, from the primary intention. The Apoſtle calls the Goſpel *the power of God to ſalvation*, Rom. 1. 16. The word is called *the word of Life*, though to ſome through their obſtinacy, it turns to condemnation, and to death. If our author in this queſtion, take liberty to differ from all (as himſelf profeſſeth) I hope he will not be diſpleaſed, if all differ from him, *Hanc veniam petimuſque, damuſque, viciſſim.*

Under *Moſes* his adminiſtration, commands were frequent and full; ſpiritual promiſes were rare and more obſcure.

Sixthly, *In Moſes time, and under his adminiſtration, commands were frequent and full, as well ceremonial, as moral, as alſo menaces.*

The

The directive, and maledictive part of the Law, were clear and open, for discovery of sinne, to work to a sense of danger, to put them in a posture to look for and long after the Messiah; But the promises more obscure, (I mean the promises of eternity) scarce known, any otherwise then as they were shadowed out in temporal things. This (as the Apostle shews) was figured by that vaile, which was before *Moses* his face, when he spake with the people upon the renuing of the Tables, *Moses* his face upon his converse with God in the *Mount*, shone with that glory, that *Aaron* and all the children of *Israel* were afraid to come nigh, *Exod.* 34. 30. Afterwards he speaks to the people, and talks with them; *And till he had done speaking with them, he put a vaile before his face*, verse 33. Whereupon the Apostle having entred comparison between the Ministers of the Law, and the Ministers of the Gospel, alludes to this vaile before *Moses* his face, 2*Cor.* 3. 12, 13, 14. in these words, *Seeing then we have such hope,* (saith he) *we use great plainnesse of speech, and not as* Moses *which put a vaile over his face, that the children of* Israel *could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished, but their mindes were blinded;* Upon which *Diodati* saith; *Moses Ministry kept the people under the shadows of ceremonies, without contemplating the mysteries which were figured by them to the bottom, which was reserved for the time of the Gospel*, Heb. 10. 4. *Whereof was a figure that vaile on* Moses *his face; Not* (saith he) *that, that was the end of that act of* Moses, *but of that which the Apostle saith, may be allegorically understood thereby, namely of the obscure dispensation of the Law;* Which obscure dispensation meeting with that blindnesse that was in the judgements of that people, held them in such ignorance, that they saw little of Grace in that covenant, but rather through their blinde mistake, looked upon it (the generality of them) as a covenant of Works. And this the Apostle signifies in the place before quoted, as also, *Rom.* 10. 3. *They being ignorant of Gods righteousnesse, and going about to establish their own righteousnesse, have not submitted themselves to the righteousnesse of God.* This caused them so tenaciously to hold to the precepts of the Law (especially to the ceremonial part, which though more burdensome, yet was easilier fitted to their corruption) that they refused *Christ* the end of the Law for righteousnesse sake, to every one that beleeveth, *Rom.* 10. 3.

Se-

Seventhly, *There was yet ſo much of grace, and Chriſt held out in this covenant, that they were not only left without excuſe, that were under it; but convinced of ſin, if they ſaw not Chriſt and the grace of the covenant in it.* Chriſt in his conteſt with the Jewes (who would not receive him, but ſtood in oppoſition, and raiſed perſecution againſt him,) appeales to the Scriptures, Old Teſtament-Scriptures; *Search the Scriptures, for they teſtifie of me, and in them you think to have eternal life*, Iohn 5. 39. Where we ſee a double *encomiam* of the Scriptures. 1. From the Iewes own acknowledgement, In them eternal life may be found. 2. From the teſtimony they give of Chriſt, In them, upon ſearch, Chriſt may be found; There are ſuch diſcoveries there, that hold him out, and eternal life in him, to thoſe that ſearch them. And they ſuſpecting, by that intimacy of communion that he profeſt to have with the Father, and the heavy charge that he laid upon them, that he was about to accuſe them to the Father; Chriſt puts it off from himſelf, and puts it upon one that they had leaſt in ſuſpition, even *Moſes*, *Moſes* in whom they truſted, in whom they pretended to repoſe confidence; It is he that is ready to accuſe them, not of breach of the Law, or tranſgreſſion of any command of his, (which they could eaſilier have beleeved) but of unbeliefe of *Moſes*; *You have one that accuſeth you, even* Moſes, *in whom you truſt; for had ye beleeved* Moſes, *ye would have beleeved me, for he wrote of me.* Unbelief in Chriſt, ſet forth in *Moſes*, is a ſinne, which *Moſes* his writings ſhall charge upon them. So alſo in that ſpeech of Chriſt to the two diſciples in the way to *Emmaus*, *O ye fools and ſlow of heart, to beleeve all that the Prophets have ſpoken; ought not Chriſt to have ſuffered thoſe things, & to enter into his glory?* where we ſee them charged with ſin, in that they underſtood not Chriſt in the Prophets, Chriſt in *Moſes*, as follows there in the next words; *Beginning at* Moſes *and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them all the Scriptures the things concerning himſelfe*, Luke 24. 25, 26, 27. *They that dwell at Jeruſalem and their Rulers, becauſe they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the Prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they fulfilled them in condemning him*, Acts 13. 27.

There was ſo much of Grace and Chriſt held out in the Old Covenant to leave them without excuſe.

Eighthly, *There are thoſe phraſes in* Moſes, *which are ordinarily quoted, as holding out a covenant of Works, and in a rigid interpretation are no other; yet in a qualified ſenſe, in a Goſpel-ſenſe, and according*

Many phraſes in uſe under the Old Covenant-adminiſtration ſeemingly holding out a Covenant of Works, according to Scripture uſe hold out a Covenant of Grace.

cording to Scripture-use of the phrase, they hold out a covenant of Grace, and the termes and conditions of it; To instance in some few, *Deut.4.1. Now therefore hearken, O* Israel, *unto the statutes, and unto the judgements which I teach you to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possesse the land which the Lord God of your fathers giveth you*, Deut.5.33. *You shall walk in all the wayes which the Lord your God hath commanded you, that ye may live, and that it may be well with you; and that ye may prolong your dayes in the land which ye shall possesse*, Deut. 30.16. *In that I command this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his wayes and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgements, that thou mayest live and multiply, and the Lord thy God shall blesse thee in the land whither thou goest to possesse it.* Deut.6.24,25. *And the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God for our good always, that he might preserve us alive as it is this day. And it shall be our righteousnesse if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us.* We may so interpret those Scriptures (and the Jewes, as it appears for a great part, did so interpret them) that they hold out a covenant of Works, when Grace was not at all acknowledged to assist in doing, nor Christ known at all to satisfie for failing, and to expiate for transgression. These seeing nothing but a reward upon labour, and punishment in case of transgression. They may yet be so interpreted as taking Grace, in the Work, for change of the heart, and putting it into a posture for obedience, according to that even in *Moses*, Deut.30 6. *I will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live*, and so these duties are only Gospel qualifications of truth and sincerity of obedience. In this sense (which they may well bear, and I take to be their native sense) here is no more than what we finde in the Gospel, from Christ and the Apostles. *They that have done good, shall rise unto the resurrection of life*, John 5. 28. *To them that by patient continuing in well-doing, seek for glory and immortality, eternal life*, Rom.2.5. Where (as in many other places) we may see, that according to the New covenant, a man may make the attaining of life, the end of his work, and the Reader may see phrases of this nature, to be New covenant, New Testament, and Gospel-language; unlesse they will charge Christ and the Apostles to have Old Testament-spirits. To save a mans

self

ſelf may be ſo underſtood as to bear a ſenſe, purely legal, anti-Evangelical, and oppoſite to Grace or Faith in Chriſt, and ſo it is uſed by the Apoſtle, or a phraſe very near it; *For by Grace ye are ſaved through Faith, not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God*, Eph. 2. 8. Not obſcurely ſhewing, that if we are ſaved of our ſelves, it is not of Grace, not of Faith, and not the gift of God. Yet the phraſe may be underſtood in a Goſpel-ſenſe, as requiring and implying no more than our endeavour in a ſtate of grace, through the aſſiſtance of the Spirit, to walk in Salvation-way, To ſtrive to enter in at the ſtrait gate, and to ſeek the Kingdome of God, and the righteouſneſſe of it, and ſo we finde it uſed, and that more than once in Scriptures, 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. *Take heed unto thy ſelf, and unto the doctrine; in ſo doing thou wilt ſave thy ſelf, and them that hear thee.* Miniſters taking heed to doctrine, ſave hearers, and yet are no ſaviours, in oppoſition, but in ſubordination to the Lord Jeſus; Miniſters and others taking heed to themſelves, ſave themſelves, and yet are no ſelf-ſaviours in oppoſition to free grace, the merit of, or faith in Chriſt Jeſus; *Peter* in his firſt Sermon after receiving of the holy Ghoſt preacht the Goſpel, yet he urg'd this, which ſome will have to be no other than a covenant of Works; *Save your ſelves from this untoward generation*, Act. 2. 40. And the Apoſtle preacht no other thing than Chriſt and him crucified, when he called on the *Philippians*, *to work out their own ſalvation with fear and trembling*, Phil. 2. 12. *To be found in our own righteouſneſſe, in that ſenſe that* Paul *uſes it*, Phil. 3. 8. *doth exclude the righteouſneſſe of faith*, that was no bottom on which he durſt ſtand; yet in the ſenſe that *Ezekiel* uſes it, the ſoul is delivered by it, *Though* Noah, Daniel, *and* Job *ſtood before me, they would but deliver their own ſoules by their righteouſneſs*, Ezek. 14. 14. ſo Ezek. 18. 22. *In his righteouſneſs that he hath done he ſhall live*; *Noah* was an heir of the *righteouſneſs of faith*, Heb. 11. 7. as the Holy Ghoſt himſelf witneſſeth; yet the ſame Holy Ghoſt tells us, *that his own righteouſneſs delivers his ſoul.* So *Solomon* ſaith, *Righteouſneſſe delivers from death*; he doth not only ſay, it would deliver, were it exact and compleat, but (ſuch as it is) it doth deliver, *Prov.* 20. 2. *David* (as *Paul* obſerves) *deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works*, Rom. 4. 6. Yet the ſame *David* puts bleſſedneſſe upon works, *Pſal.* 112. 1. *Bleſſed is the man that feareth the*

Lord that delighteth greatly in his commandments. Pſalme 119.12. *Bleſſed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the Law of the Lord; Bleſſed are they that keep his teſtimonies, that ſeek him with the whole heart.* Pſ. 128.1. *Bleſſed is every one that feareth the Lord, that walketh in his wayes.* And ſo alſo the Apoſtle *James*, *Who ſo looketh into the perfect Law of Liberty, and continueth therein, not being a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the word, that man ſhall be bleſſed in his deed,* *James* 1.25. The Apoſtle *Peter* tells us, *We are kept by the mighty power of God through faith unto ſalvation,* 1Pet. 1.5. Our ſalvation is not in our own keeping, It is not our own care, that frees us from deſtruction; yet *John* ſaith, *He that is begotten of God ſinneth not, and keepeth himſelf, that the wicked one toucheth him not,* 1John 5.18. Here are the ſame words affirmed, and denied, and both from one and the ſame mouth of truth; a different ſenſe therefore is to be enquired after. A righteouſneſſe, which is the condition of the covenant of Works; out of our own inherent ſtrength and abilities, in an exact perfection, is denied, a righteouſneſſe, not of us, but through grace wrought in us, in ſincerity, which the covenant of Grace calls for, is aſſerted and required.

Though *Moſes* delivered a Covenant of Grace to *Iſrael*, yet the Law is ſometime taken in that reſtrained ſenſe as to hold forth a Covenant of Works.

Ninthly, Though the whole Law that *Moſes* delivered from God on Mount *Sinai* to the people (and is among the ſacred Oracles of God for poſterity) do containe a covenant of Grace, yet the Law is taken ſometime in that ſtrict ſenſe, as containing a covenant of Works, and holding forth life upon condition of perfect obedience. So the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 10.5,6. puts an oppoſition between the righteouſneſſe of the Law, and the righteouſneſs of Faith; So alſo *Gal.* 3.18. *If righteouſneſſe be by the Law, it is no more of Promiſe*, So that, there is a neceſſity of diſtinguiſhing, between *the Law, abſtracted from the Promiſe*, the Promiſe of Chriſt, I meane the Evangelical Promiſe, and the Law, *including this Promiſe*, and writing of Chriſt Jeſus, ſo that the works of the Law, conſidered in the bare mandatory part of it, can ſave none; *If righteouſneſſe come by the Law, then Chriſt is dead in vaine*; yet the righteouſneſs *witneſſed by the Law and the Prophets, even the righteouſneſſe of God which is by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt*, Rom. 3.21,22. is, our juſtification, and brings ſalvation, *Rom.* 3.21,22. And no marvel, that *Moſes*, and the Law delivered by *Moſes*, ſhould be taken in Scripture in ſo different an acception; when circumciſion, that leading ceremony

of

of the Law, is sometimes looked upon as a Priviledge, as hath been shewed, and a saving Ordinance, *Rom.* 3. 1. *Rom.* 4. 11. And sometimes as a yoke, *A yoke that neither our fathers nor we were able to bear*; *Acts* 15. 10. yea, as a deadly ceremony, dividing and cutting off from Christ. *I* Paul *say unto you, if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing*, Gal. 5. 2. So that the Law abstracted from Christ, as the greater part of the Jews took it) was a Ministry of condemnation, 2*Cor.* 3. 9. It could never reach so high as salvation, but including Christ, it was perfect, and saves the soule, *Psal.* 19. 7. The Apostles thinks he can never sufficiently vilifie the ceremonial Fabrick, looked upon, as absolute of it self, without farther relation; We see what titles he gives those Ordinances, *Weak and beggarly elements*, Gal. 4. 9. *Rudiments of this world*, Col. 2. 8. But being taken in their relative consideration, as a School-master to Christ, they are *an attonement, a sweet savour*, they are so called, times without end; The honour due to Christ (who was an Offering and a Sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour, *Eph.* 5. 2. and by whom we receive the attonement, *Rom.* 5. 11.) without derogation from Christ, is given to them; not by way of opposition, but subordination; and not by mans device, but Gods appointment, not holding the soul from him, but ministerially serviceable to lead to him. *B.*

CHAP. XXXIV.

The Old covenant was not made up of meer carnal and temporal Promises, but contained New covenant-promises that were spiritual and saving.

THese Positions premised, to clear our way in a farther progresse in this thing; I should now look into those differences; which several parties, have not found, but made between these covenants; and to reckon up all, which some have at least hinted and touched upon, I should weary both my self and the Reader. He that pleases may finde them numerously reckoned up, by Master *Ball* in his *Treatise of the Covenant*, page

94,95,96. with his general censure and dislike of the most of them, though sparing a particular refutation which I also shall forbear. So many of them as are differences indeed, will fall in with those before delivered, and the other will fall before that which hath, and (God willing) may be spoken. There are only foure, of which I shall (by Gods assistance) take notice, upon which much controversie depends. The two former being injurious to the Old covenant laying it too low; The two latter putting too great a limit to the New covenant in respect of its latitude and extent.

The first imaginary difference between the Old and New Covenant.

First, *The Old covenant, under which the fathers lived, and which circumcision sealed (say some) was a carnal covenant, and contained only earthly promises, the mercies of the land of* Canaan, *such as were in this life to be enjoyed: But the New covenant under which we live in Gospel-times, and which Baptisme seales, contains spiritual mercies and priviledges, hath promises of everlasting salvation.* In the device of this difference Papists have led the way, and Socinians and Anabaptists follow. *Bellar.* 1. l. 1. *De Baptismo, cap.* 4. saith, and referres to what he had said before upon the question of the difference of the Sacraments of the Old and New covenant, *that the promise of God to* Abraham, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, was not in the letter of it, any promise of forgiveneſse of sinnes, but of special protection, providence, and worldly happineſse*, with whom *Stapleton* and *Becan* the Jesuits joyne hands, as they are quoted by *Chamier*, lib. 5. *de Baptismo*, cap. 11. sec. 11. though *Vasquez* one of their fraternity dissents; And Master *Blackwood* in his *Storme of Antichrists Garrison*, saith, *That these are two covenants essentially differing. The first was carnal, typical*; and shewing the difference between Baptisme and circumcision, he saith, *circumcision signed a right to* Canaan, *Baptism signes a right to the death and satisfaction of Christ*, page 32.

Ad literam non fuisse promissionem remissionis peccatorum, sed peculiaris protectionis & gubernationis & terrenæ felicitatis.

Promissio terrena erat annexa carnali Circumcissioni, & hac sola ad vetus Testamentum pertinebat; & contrarium asserere, quod facit Calvinus, *nihil est aliud, quam ex lege Evangelium facere, & omnia confundere.* Bellar. lib. 2. de effec. Sac. Cap. 17.

The several interests for which the assignation of this difference serves.

This difference of the covenants (however the reality of it will appeare in the Scriptures) serves for severall interests.

1. To decry all Old Testament Scriptures.

1. It is this high way to bring down all the honour and esteeme of Old Testament-Scriptures, If the promises there mentioned

be

be (as those of the Turkish Alcoran) sensual and carnal, yea, inferiour to them, and determine with this life; who can put such an estimate upon them? especially having at hand by them, in the New Covenant, Promises lasting to eternity. This doctrine hath produced those Atheistical jeers and blasphemies, *Old Testament-men, Old Testament-spirits*; yea, by inevitable consequence, if it may stand, it will bring the bane and ruine of New Testament-Scriptures along with it. The Old and New Testament-Scriptures, as couples in ancient buildings, so answer one the other, that, neither can stand, if either fall; It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ that we seek in New Testament-Scriptures. Now that is defined to be, *that which God before promised by his Prophets concerning his Son Christ Jesus*, Rom 1. 2. In the promise of the Prophets then, this must be found. A righteousness of faith we there seek; now this righteousnesse is *witnessed by the Law and the Prophets*, Rom. 3.21. They must then be heard witnessing; Christ is the All that in the Gospel we look after; he must be an Old Testament-Christ, whom the Law and Prophets hold out to us, or else he is not the Christ of God; All the vilifying reproaches which are fastened on the Old Testament, fall upon the head of the New Testament; yea, upon Christ Jesus.

2. It wholly takes Infants out of all Covenant with God; If that great Charter, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*, contain only carnal promises, and those proper to that people, it is determined, and now no covenant for the seed remains. Hence Papists and Antipædobaptists have their respective advantages, The Papists hence conclude Infants damnation, dying before they are taken of God into covenant by Baptisme, and Antipædobaptists joyning with them in the premisses; will they, nill they, they must be enforced to yield the Conclusion. They may fret and storme about the charge of it, and dip their pen as deep in gall as it can reach, yet they shall never wipe it off. That all out of Covenant with God, being no Church-Members, having no title to Church-Membership, are in a perishing condition, is a Scripture-Position above all exceptions. In case they will subscribe, as they do, to the Popish Tenent, that Infants in their first birth state, are out of covenant, and in no better condition than the children of Heathens, except the hope of better education,

2. To take all Infants out of Covenant.

cation, then they must agree, in Infants condemnation.

3. To keep Infants from Baptisme.

3. Antipædobaptists, hence finde a way to keep Infants from Baptisme; Being out of Covenant, they have no right to any seale of the Covenant. These several interests make them all to joyne in one, to conclude that the first was a Covenant carnal, and raising the men in Covenant, no higher than earthly expectations. But if truth may be heard, none of these interests will hold; certain it is, that those that were in the Old Covenant had better thoughts of it. The Apostle, speaking of the Patriarchs confession, that they were strangers and pilgrims on earth; makes his observation upon it; *They that say these things, plainly declare that they seek a Countrey.* A stranger, or pilgrim, is a man not at his home, but seeks a countrey. Now this countrey must either be *Earthly*, or *Heavenly*, there is not a third which men could have in desire. That it was not an earthly countrey that they sought; he makes good, *in that they had opportunity of return, they might have gone back to* Ur *of the* Chaldees *at pleasure.* Then it follows, as he inferres, that *they sought a better countrey, that is, an Heavenly*, Heb. 11.16. Men of this opinion have not only the Apostles authority against them, but (putting himself on in a Logical dispute with them) his reasons likewise, yea, those that were most carnal, and earthly-minded among them, were taught to judge better of the Promises, that they lived under; Christ gives that testimony of the Jewes, with whom he had contest, that in the Scriptures they thought to have everlasting life, *John* 5. 39. They had no Scriptures but Old Covenant-Scriptures, and of them, they had this opinion, which was no errour of theirs corrected by Christ, but were by him confirmed in it, Christ justifies them in their opinion, that in Scripture they thought to have everlasting life, and rectifies them in the way of finding everlasting life in it. A great part of the dispute is about those words of God to *Abraham*, in which the foundation of the Covenant stands, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy* [illegible] whether in them there be promises, only of earth, or of heaven likewise? And this Christ himself determines in his answer to the *Sadducees* about the Resurrection, where he applies that speech of God to *Moses* at the bush: *I am the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Isaac, *and the God of* Jacob; for proof that *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob* live for ever, *Mat.* 22. 33. How

Testimonies evincing the spirituality of Old Testament-promises.

inju-

injurious are they to the Covenant of God with his people, that put such unworthy limits upon it: Other people that were without Covenant had temporal mercies from God, they were protected, and provided for by him; *Leave thy fatherlesse children unto me, and let thy widows trust in me* (saith the Lord to the people of *Edom,*) I will keep them alive, *Jer.* 49.11. The woman of *Canaan* thought it a priviledge for *dogs to eat of the crumbs that fall from the childrens table*; for Gentiles, who were without Covenant, to partake of any little of the mercy that the people of God in Covenant did enjoy; But if this glosse of the Covenant may stand, the dogs crumbs, are beyond all the childrens provision. They will not leave their crumbs, for all that is set on the childrens table. It may seem a high speech of *Luther* after his manner, that *the Turkish Empire how great soever, is but a crumb that the great Master of the family casts to the dogs*; yet this is above all that *Israel* had in *Canaan*, if we look at no more, than a temporal possession. *Ishmael* the son of the bond-woman must be cast out, not to be heire with the son of the free-woman, *Gen.* 21.10. he and his posterity must be cast out of Covenant, and in *Isaac* the seed must be called. But if there were no more in *Isaacs* grant than the possession of *Canaan*, the son of the bond-woman had had the better of the bargain: *Ishmaelites* in earthly possessions exceeded *Israelites*; And *Esau* had not need to have complained so much of the losse of his birth right, and his brothers supplantation of him; if *Jacob* had gained no more than a possession for his posterity in *Canaan*, having that blessing both promised and performed; *That his dwelling should be the fatnesse of the earth, and the dew of Heaven from above*; Gen. 27.39. he had small cause of envie of his brothers felicity. How did the Saints of those times boast of God, exult and triumph in him, proclaiming his goodnesse, *That there was no Rock like their God?* If their portion did reach (with the men of this world) only to this life, none can be able to give a reason of such triumphant exultations. And the *Psalmist* had never spoken of it as the worlds portion, in case himself had looked for no better an inheritance. Providence was, indeed, singularly eminent over that people, yet considering their great afflictions which they still bore, and heavy chastisements wherewith they were exercised, if that special care of God, had not had an influence upon eternity,

Imperium Turcicum quantum quantum est, mica est quam pater familias projicit canibus.

nity, that blasphemous conclusion of the Oratour, *that a man might see how much the gods esteemed the Nation of the Iewes, in that they were so often carried into captivity*, would hardly receive a satisfying refutation. Certainly their sufferings were above any other Nation, *Amos* 3. 2. *You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities*, if then they had their hope only in this life, and were not chastened in the world, that they might not be condemned with the world; as the Apostle speaks of Christians, so we might say of the Nation of the Jewes; *Of all Nations in the world they were the most miserable.* See *Chamier, lib.* 5. *de Baptism. cap.* 11. *sect.* 11. *Whitakers praelectiones de Sacramentis contra Bellar. pag.* 125. *Rivet. in Gen.* 17. *Exercitat.* 87.

CHAP. XXXV.

The Old Covenant was a pure Gospel-Covenant, and not mixt.

2ly. OThers that rise not so high against the first covenant, as to make it a covenant meerly carnal; yet loth to yield to so much truth, as to confesse it to be a covenant Evangelical; have found out a middle way; which yet they think may carry on their interests, and say, *It is not a pure Gospel-covenant, but mixt*; and therein differs from the second covenant, which is wholly Evangelical: In which they seem to go, but one half of the way with their old friends the Jesuites, from whom in this controversie they so much glean, yet, far enough to sit down with Anabaptists, to cast Infants (as they hope) out of the covenant and Church-membership, and so exclude them from Baptisme. Here I shall undertake to make good these foure particulars.

M. see Page 220.

That expression of a mixt Covenant under which the Fathers are supposed to live untoward.

1. That this expression of theirs is very untoward; and such that will bear no fair sense, without the utter overthrow, even of that difference between the Covenants, which they would build on this distinction.

2. That the proof that they bring of this mixture of the first covenant is very weak, and not at all cogent.

3. That they are not constant to themselves, but give and take, and know not what to determine.

4. In

4. In case all were granted, yet they know not how to bring any thing home, of all that they say, to serve their own interests. Their expressions, I say, are untoward, in denying purity of Gospel in the first Covenant, and affirming a mixture. That which is not pure, but mixt, is a compound of pure and impure; such that hath some ingredients, such as they ought, and others such that make all adulterate: *As silver mingled with drosse, or wine with water*, Isa. 1. 22. The false teachers (Saint *Pauls* adversaries) preach such a mixt Gospel, when they urged with such vehemency a mixture of works, which caused the Apostle to stand in such feare of the *Corinthians, lest they should be drawn away from the simplicity that is in Christ*, 2 Cor. 11.2. They do not beleeve that the Gospel which *Paul* tells us was preached to *Abraham*, Gal. 3.8. was any such impure Gospel, this sure is not their meaning, they dare not say that *Abraham* was under any such delusion; What then can be the meaning, but that he had promises, not only of blisse, and in reference to eternal salvation; but also promises of earthly concernment, as that of the land of *Canaan*, and his plantation there? *The Covenant takes its denomination from the Promises*, (saith one of them) *but the Promises are mixt; some Evangelical, belonging to those to whom the Gospel belongeth; some are domestick or civil Promises, specially respecting the house of* Abraham, *and the policie of* Israel. To this I readily agree, and then the distinction falls to nothing; Seeing in Gospel times, in New Testament-dayes, this will denominate a not pure, but mixt Gospel as well as in those times, we our selves are under such a Gospel as well as the Jewes. I know not how we could pray in faith, *Give us this day our daily bread*; in case we were without a promise of these things, or *how man could live by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God*, in case we had no word from God. The Apostle tells us, *Godlinesse hath the promise of this life, and that which is to come*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. It would trouble many a perplexed man in case he could not make good, that those words, *Verily thou shalt be fed*, Psal. 37. 3. did not at all belong to him. There is no believing man in any relation, but he hath Gospel-Promises in concernment to that relation, as appears in that speech of *Pauls* encouragement of servants, *Epes.* 6. 8. *Knowing whatsoever for good thing any man doth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free.* It

It were ill with all ſorts, had not they their domeſtick relation-promiſes, which theſe ſpeak of, as making a mixture.

2. As their expreſſions are untoward, ſo taking them at the beſt, their proof is weak, *That the Covenant takes its denomination from the Promiſes; but the Promiſes are mixt*, ſay theſe men. The moſt eminent Promiſes, which contain the marrow of all, give the denomination, and not ſuch that are annext as Appendants to them. The Promiſe of the land of *Canaan*, is an appendant to the great covenant made of God with *Abraham*, as *Chamier* with good warrant from the text, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. calls it, *lib. de baptiſ. cap. ſec.* The Covenant being made of God, to be the God of *Abraham* and his ſeed, which might have been made good whereſoever they had inhabited or ſojourned, the promiſe of *Canaan* is over and above added to it. The reaſon given in by one for his diſlike of *Chamiers* expreſſion, calling it an Appendix to the covenant, is little to purpoſe, *Pſal.* 105. 10, 11. *The gift of the land of* Canaan *is called a Covenant*, ſaith he, *and therefore is not an appendant to it.* By the ſame reaſon Circumciſion muſt be the Covenant, and not a Seal appendant to it; ſeeing Circumciſion is called a Covenant, *Gen.* 17.10. they are not ignorant of theſe Scripture-metonymies.

3. As the proof is weak, to make the Covenant not a pure Goſpel-covenant, but mixt; ſo, they are not conſtant to themſelves, pointing that out, which makes pure Goſpel, *Gen.* 17. 5. *Gen.* 15. 5. *Gen.* 12. 3. *Gen.* 18. 18. illuſtrated by ſome New Teſtament-Scriptures, *Rom.* 4. 17, 18. *Gal.* 3. 8, 9, 16. *Acts* 3. 25. one obſerves, *it is to be noted, that thoſe Promiſes, which were Evangelical, according to the more inward ſenſe of the Holy Ghoſt, do point at the priviledges of* Abrahams *houſe in the outward face of the words*, and thereupon raiſes a doubt, whether any covenant made with *Abraham* be ſimply Evangelical? And ſo he findes out Evangelical-Promiſes in the inwards of that covenant, which is non-Evangelical in the outward face; So *Bellarmine*, with whom he ſo much (to ſpeak in his own language) ſymbolizeth, finds out ſpiritual Evangelical Promiſes, in that which he concludes to be of another nature; denying that the Promiſe made to *Abraham* in the letter, was any Promiſe of forgiveneſſe of ſins, but *of ſpecial protection and government, and earthly happineſſe*; yet confeſſeth that in a myſtical

stical sense they were spiritual Promises, both of pardon of sin, and life eternal, and that they belong to us, *Bellar. de Sacr. Bapt. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. whereupon *Chamier* observes, That which is promised mystically, God in covenant doth promise, but heaven is here promised mystically; therefore in this covenant here is a Promise of heaven; so the inward, and outward face, will be all Evangelical.

Mystico quodam sensu fuisse etiam spirituales promissiones & remissionis peccatorum ac vitæ æternæ & ad nos pertinere.

Lastly, they yet know not how to bring any thing home (were all granted) to serve their interest, they seem to contend that the Evangelical Promises are vested in the persons of true Believers. The other which are civil, or domestick, serving to make up the mixture, were priviledges descendable, and traducible to posterity, and upon this account, circumcision of the natural seed of *Abraham* came in for confirmation and seale of that which alone was civil, domestical, and non-Evangelical; and being not considered, as a leading Sacrament of the whole Church, as Baptisme is now, but only of the Jewish Church, as such, proper to *Abraham* and his posterity, and much differing from Baptisme, it is no argument that we in Gospel-times transmit any such priviledge to posterity, or that our seed before actual faith, have any title to the covenant. This seems to be their meaning, to which we have many things to say.

Circumcision was a Seal of spiritual mercies of the same that Baptisme sealeth.

First, that Orthodox Divines, both ancient and moderne have made circumcision to be of the same signification and use as Baptism, and till Anabaptists closed, they had no adversaries but Papists, who to advance their *opus operatum* in the Sacraments of the New Testament, will have them, as far to exceed the Old, as heaven doth earth, and the substance doth the shadow; This is observed by *Chamier Panstrat. Cathol. Tom.* 4. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 19. *sect.* 58. having reckoned up several testimonies to this purpose, he addes, (a) *There are very many like testimonies, by which it appears, that Christians were heretofore perswaded that there was no so great difference between circumcision and baptisme; and why, saith he, is it now changed? Truly in favour of the Papists, and according to the pleasure of the Iesuites.*

a *Plurima sunt ejusdem testimonia ex quibus constat persuasum olim fuisse Christianis, non fuisse admodum diversam circumcisionis rationem & Baptismi. Cur hodie mutatum? & quidem in Papistarum gratiam & quidem ad arbitrium Jesuitarum.*

Secondly, if circumcision have respect to those Promises that were no Gospel-mercies, but civil, domestical, restrained to Jews, and not appertaining to Christians; How could it be a distinction between Jew and Gentile respective to Religion? it might have

made a civil distinction, and the want of it have been an evidence against other Nations, that they had been none of the multiplied seed of *Abraham* according to the flesh, and that their interest had not been in *Canaan*. But how it could have concluded them to have been *without Christ, strangers from the covenant of Promise, having no hope, and without God in the world*, as the Apostle determines upon their uncircumcision, *Eph.* 2. 11, 12. cannot be imagined.

Thirdly, How is it that we hear so much in Scripture of *circumcision of the heart*, Jer. 4. 4. Rom. 2. 28. Deut. 10. 16. Deut. 30. 6. Ezek. 44. 9. and the circumcised to have this character, that *they worship God in Spirit and in Truth*; if circumcision have not relation to Promises that are spiritual? When complaint is made of uncircumcision in heart, is it not (as it is ordinarily understood) that their mindes were carnal, and not taken up with spiritual things? or is it that they were not fixt on their civil and domestick interests? when they are said to be uncircumcised, as *Ier.* 6. 10. is it not upon that account that *Jeremy* there gives, that *they could not hear the Word of the Lord, that they had no delight in it, that it was a reproach to them*; or is it because they could not suck in Promises of meer civil, home, and self interests? So it must need be if circumcision be such a Seale, when they emproved it for the use to which it was instituted, they kept the right use of it, and were not worthy of reproof concerning it.

Fourthly, what Sacraments had the Jewes of any Gospel-relation, if this respected alone their civil interests? There might be more spoken to that of the Passeover, to carry it to peculiar National mercies, than to this of circumcision. See *Exod.* 13. 14, 15. *And it shall be when thy sonne asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of Bondage. And it came to passe when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the Lord slew all the first-borne in the land of Egypt; both the first borne of man, and the first-borne of beasts; therefore I sacrifice unto the Lord all that openeth the Matrix, being males; but all the first-born of my children, I redeem.* I am sure far lesse can be said to carry it to that which is spiritual, and of common concernment both to Jews and Christians.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, how is it that the Apoſtle giving a definition of circumciſion, refers it to nothing national, civil, or domeſtick; but only to that which is purely ſpiritual, ſpeaking of *Abraham*, he ſaith; *He received the ſigne of Circumciſion, a ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumciſed?* The righteouſneſſe of faith, is a Promiſe purely Evangelical, *Romanes* 3. 22. *Romanes* 3. 30. *Romanes* 10. 3. *Philippians* 3. 8. and this Circumciſion ſealed, the ſelf-ſame thing that our Sacraments ſeale; So that as their extraordinary Sacraments are expreſſely affirmed to be the ſame with ours, by the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10. 3. *They eat all the ſame ſpiritual meat, and did all drink the ſame ſpiritual drink*, ſo are their appointed eſtabliſhed Sacraments, Circumciſion, and the Paſſeover. Will they with *Bellarmine, lib.* 1. *cap.* 17. *de Sacramentis in genere*, deny, that *Circumciſion was an univerſal ſeale of faith, and affirme that it was only an individual ſeale of the individual faith of* Abraham, that ſo all may fall to the ground which is ſpoken from that Text of the uſe of Circumciſion to the Jewes, all that is there ſpoken, having reference only to *Abraham* in perſon; I anſwer, 1. This Popiſh ſhift is flat againſt the Apoſtle; He brings it as an argument for proof of the way, of our Juſtification to be by faith alone, which were a meer inconſequence, if proper to him, and not belonging to others. 2. It is flat againſt *Moſes*, who referres this of circumciſion to the covenant there mentioned, *Geneſis* 17. 7. But the covenant is not with *Abraham* alone, but his ſeed alſo together with him, as is there plaine. 3. It carries ſeveral abſurdities with it. (1.) By this meanes Gods covenant with *Abraham* in perſon, and his covenant with Chriſtians in Goſpel-times is indeed the ſame; but his covenant with all beleevers in the Old Teſtament and with beleevers in the New Teſtament are eſſentially differing. *Abraham*, and New-Teſtament beleevers, are under one covenant; Old Teſtament-beleevers are under a covenant eſſentially differing. (2.) Then *Zachary*, *Luke* 1. 72. interpreting the covenant made with *Abraham* of ſalvation by Chriſt ſhould have limited it to *Abraham*, and not extended it to the Fathers; But we ſee all are there, under one and the ſame mercy; our father *Abraham*; and all that followed

him, even all that came out of *Egypt*, and were for *Canaan*, are called Fathers, 1 *Corinth.* 10. 1. All our Fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all these had the same mercy in promise with *Abraham*. *To performe the mercy* (saith *Zachary*) *promised to our Fathers, and to remember his holy covenant, the Oath which he sware to our father* Abraham. (3.) Then *Abraham* himself in person, and Christians in the dayes of the Gospel are interessed in Christ, and all other beleevers in the Law were without Christ; but the contrary is plain. *Moses* esteemed the reproach of Christ greater than the treasures of *Egypt*, *Heb.* 11. 26. (4.) Then *Abraham* and Christians have from God the Kingdom of heaven and salvation; but the rest of the Jewes have nothing better than the land of *Canaan*. They have no more than the covenant reaches unto, and the seale of the covenant did confirm; But the covenant reaches only temporal Promises, as the land of *Canaan*, in their opinion. These evasions *Bellarmine* is put to, and Anabaptists are glad to follow, both of them willing to say any thing rather than confesse a truth.

Object. But they say, This was a seale to *Abraham, of the righteousnesse of faith, that he might be the Father of all them that beleeve, &c.* But only *Abraham* is such a father.

Sol. *Answ.* This priority of receiving the Faith, and the signe and seale, is proper to *Abraham*; each one could not be first, but father and childe, both received it, and both had the righteousnesse of Faith sealed in it. If *Bellarmine* please so well, I shall referre to *Bellarmines* opposites, *Chamier de Sacramentis in genere, lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *Amef. Tom.* 3. more especially *Whittaker prælectiones de Sacramentis page* 22. 23. *Hoc desperationis, &c.* So that which way soever they take, truth fastens upon them, and the friends of truth flie in their face; and all to make it appear that a pure Gospel was preach't to *Abraham*, and that the first covenant was not mixt, but truly Evangelical.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXV.

The Covenant of Grace in Gospel-times admits Christians, in a State of unregeneration, and is not limited in the bounds of it to the Elect regenerate.

THe two former supposed differences did lay the first covenant too low, not vouchsafing it the honour of a Gospel-covenant, or at the best, a mixt Gospel; Two others follow, which will hold us longer, that put too great a limit to the second covenant, in respect of the latitude and extent of it. A third difference therefore assigned by some, is, that the first covenant took in all the seed of *Abraham*, by *Isaac* and *Jacob*, as many as professed themselves to be of the Faith, and that were willing to joyne in the worship of the God of *Abraham*. The New Covenant, they affirm, admits no more than Elect Regenerate persons. The Gospel strips us of all relative Covenant-holinesse, of all holinesse that is not real, and intrinsecal, and God owns none, as his Covenant-people, but Elect regenerate persons. In the first place we shall take what is yielded, or at least not gain-sayed, and after proceed to the examination of what is affirmed.

A third supposed difference between the Old and New Covenant.

In Old Testament-times the covenant was made with *Israel* in the uttermost latitude and extent, with all that bore the name of *Israel*, as we may see, *Deut.* 29. at large held forth. There is a covenant entred, and the words of it expresst, 1. With *Israel*, *verse* 1. 2. With *all Israel*, *verse* 2. 3. With *them to whom God had not given an heart to perceive, eyes to see, and eares to hear*, ver. 4. *viz.* with unregenerate persons. 4. It is made with *Captaines of Tribes, Elders, Officers, little Ones, Wives, Strangers, Hewers of wood, Drawers of water*, vers. 10, 11. 5. With *them that were present*, and with them *that were absent*, verse 14. 15. All this clearly shews in how great a latitude this covenant is entred; No *Israelite* of any Sex, Age, Rank, nor any that joyned themselves to that body are exempted. Which also farther appears in those innumerable places of Scripture, where God owns that people generally, promiscuously as his people, professing himself to be their God, and he is the God of none, but a covenant-people, of his own covenant-people, others are without God, *Eph.* 2. 12. He was the God of all that came out of *Egypt*, *Exod.* 20. 2.

All of Israel were in Covenant in Old Testament-times.

I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of Bondage; Of all that whole family, Amos 3. 1. *Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against thee, O children of* Israel, *against the whole family which I have brought up from the land of Egypt. Hear, O* Israel, *the Lord our God is one Lord*, Deut. 6. 4. Yea, *Israel* at the very worst is thus owned as Gods in covenant; *Hear, O my people, and I will testifie unto thee, O Israel, if thou wilt hearken unto me: but my people would not hearken to my voice*, Israel *would have none of me*, Psal. 81. 8, 11. *The Oxe knows his Owner, the Asse his Masters crib, but* Israel *doth not know, my people doth not consider*, Isa. 1. 3. *Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge*, Isa. 5. 13. *My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge*, Hos. 4. 6. *And when they entred into the Heathen, whither they went, they prophaned my holy Name; when they said unto them, These are the people of the Lord*, Ezek. 36. 20. This is brought as a motive to withhold *Israel* from sin; *Ye are the children of the Lord your God, ye shall not cut your selves, nor make any baldnesse between your eyes for the dead, for thou art an holy people to the Lord thy God*, Deut. 14. 1, 2. This is pleaded as an aggravation of sin; *You have I known of all the Nations of the earth, and therfore you will I punish for all your iniquities*, Amos 3. 2. This is brought as a motive to prevail with God under misery for mercy; *Behold we beseech thee, we are all thy people*, Isa. 64. 9. Yea, this covenant takes with God for national mercies: The whole of the Nation then is in covenant. *Then will I remember my covenant with* Jacob, *and my covenant with* Isaac, *and also my covenant with* Abraham *will I remember, and will remember the land*, Levit. 26. 42. The Apostles authority puts it out of question, Reckoning up the priviledges of *Israel* according to the flesh, nine in number, *Rom.* 9. 4. This is one, *The covenants*, *Israel* then after the flesh was in covenant; All *Israel* were the covenant-people of God. There were many not Elect, not Regenerate; but there was not a man not in covenant, not owned of God as visibly his; *Thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God.* — *And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his people*, Deut. 26. 17, 18. This was the state of the Church of old. But now, as is affirmed, it is far otherwise. God is not so large in his priviledges, nor so ample in his munificence, none have honour to be in covenant in Gospel-times, but real beleevers, men truly san-

sanctified and regenerate. And here it cannot be denied, but there are many expressions, ordinarily found in many Orthodox Writers, and like passages frequently heard in Sermons from godly Ministers, seemingly implying, if not asserting it, and restraining the covenant onely to the elect and regenerate. As when they give Marks and signes of mens being in covenant with God, this must needs imply that some professing Christians are in covenant with God, and some without, which is yet farther evidenced, when they conclude, that in case a man be in covenant with God, then happinesse and salvation follows; But when these men fully explain themselves, they yeeld up again to us, that which seemingly they had taken from us, and ordinarily do distinguish of an outward, and inward covenant, acknowledging the outward covenant to be made with every member of the Church and the Parents, with that hear and professedly accept the promises, and their children, But the inward covenant as they say, belongs to them onely, that receive the benefits of it, and are upright in it. An eminent Divine putting the Question, and returning answer, How a man may know himself to be in covenant with God; presently foresees an Objection against any such Quære. As *Saul* and all the people of *Israel* were in covenant with God, so all professing Christians are covenanters likewise; and hereby all distinguishing notes of Professors, some in covenant, and some without must needs fall to the ground, one member then of the distinction, having no being for solution of the doubt, he layes down a distinction. *There is* (saith he) *a twofold covenant.* 1. *A single Covenant which God makes with his children when they are baptized, which is this; if ye will believe, repent, and walk in my ways, ye shall be saved, now if they break this condition, God is freed.* 2. *A double covenant to performe both parts, which is this, if you will repent and beleeve, ye shall be saved, and I will give you an heart, and you shall repent, believe, and be saved:* So *Preston* on Attributes, *part* 2. *page* 85, 86. These distinctions, plainly yeeld that there is a covenant between God and man, in this latitude, of which we speak, and which here is expresst, and that all professed Christians so called, are in an outward and single covenant, which puts them into a capacity of Sacraments, and their children, which is a covenant properly so called, and which Scripture holds out for the covenant of God with his

Some Divines seem to put too great a restraint upon the Covenant in New Testament times.

Distinctions holding forth the meaning of these Divines in these expressions.

people. These Divines yeelding so much, and their meaning being so Orthodox, there is no reason of contraversie with them, or contention about words; Yet I should choose rather to expresse my self in *Pareus* his words against *Stapleton* the Jesuite, on 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. objecting against this doctrine, for it is a doctrine which Antipædobaptists, and Independents have borrowed from Jesuites, and we have them all in this, as in many other things our Adversaries, *To be in covenant, is taken two ways, either according to title to the covenant, or to the benefits of the covenant. He is said to be in covenant, that either obtaines the benefits of the covenant, which are remission of sinnes, adoption, &c. Or else that hath onely the title, and outward badge of the covenant, so that he is repute to have interest in it, and is not an alien from it.* The right of covenant belongs to all that externally make profession. These engage themselves upon Gods termes. The benefit of the covenant, remission of sinnes, justification, adoption, &c. belongs only to the Elect regenerate. Or farther we may distinguish of the covenant of grace, and the grace following the covenant, The covenant of grace is in the latitude before mentioned, the grace following the covenant in that restriction that some contend for, or else we may distinguish of entring covenant, and stedfastnesse and faithfulnesse in the covenant; All enter that are visible professors, onely the elect and faithful are steady in it. This distinction is evidently grounded on *Psal.* 78. 34. *They remembred that God was their rock, the high God their Redeemer, nevertheless their heart was not right in them, neither were they stedfast in his covenant.* All covenant-enterers, are not covenant-keepers. To take off this restriction, and for overthrow of this imaginary difference, it were enough to require of these Asserters of this covenant-restriction, and limit, where God hath put any such restraint, for *affirmanti incumbit probatio*, and to require some reason, why men in nature, in Old Testament-times, should be honoured with that neare relation to God, as to be of the Common-wealth of this people, enjoying not barely civil and domestick Priviledges, but saving Ordinances, and under the Gospel, must stand shut out of all such visible relations; why unregenerate men in order to regeneration, may not come under the discipline of God under the Gospel, as well as under Old Testament-dispensations? Why poor

Esse in fœdere dicitur dupliciter, vel quoad jus fœderis, vel quoad fœderis beneficia. Est in fœdere, vel qui obtinet beneficia fœderis, quæ sunt remissio peccatorum, adoptio, regeneratio, salus, vel qui tantum habet jus, vel symbolum fœderis externum, ut socius fœderis, non alienus censeatur.

poore ſinners that confeſſe with their mouth with the Eunuch, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Sonne of God, *Acts* 8. 37. may not be indulged thoſe proviledges (now Chriſt is come in the fleſh to ſave ſinners) whereby they may be brought to be beleeve with the heart that they may be ſaved? To thoſe that would make ſuch a diſtance between the covenants, as to throw out of the covenant of God, and viſible communion, all that are unregenerate, we may ſpeak in Chriſts words, *From the beginning it was not ſo*, and either we muſt ſee ſome good ground, that in this there is by the will of God, this great change, or elſe we ſhall beleeve, *as it was then, ſo it now.* But I ſhall deale more liberally, and make it appear, that the Goſpel doth not only not quit us of it, but eſtabliſhes it; doth not only not aboliſh it (as it doth the Types of the Law) but holds it forth, and gives teſtimony of the continuance of it.

CHAP. XXXVII.

New Teſtament-Scriptures aſſerting the latitude of the covenant of Grace in Goſpel-times.

New Teſtament-Scriptures holding out the Covenant of Grace in its full and juſt latitude. Matth. 28.19

LEt that Text *Matth.* 28.19. in the firſt place be weighed *Go, teach all Nations, &c.* which our adverſaries in this cauſe willingly conſent to have tranſlated, *Diſciple all Nations*, and therefore there needs no words nor ſtir to be made about it, and that a Diſciple of Chriſt is in covenant with God, is as freely confeſt, he takes God in Chriſt to be his God, he layes claime to ſalvation by him; this ground being laid, in which I think I have not an adverſary, I draw from hence a twofold Argument.

First, that covenant between God and man, which is committed to the Miniſtry of man to work, to judge of being wrought, and to put to a Seale for confirmation of it, is a covenant onely viſibl entred, and doth not require any inward real change, or work upon the ſoule to the being of it. This Propoſition is

clear, man can judge no farther than of that which is outward and visible, *Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.* If none but a regenerate elect person be in covenant, then none but God knowes who are in covenant. Then we may apply that of the Apostle spoken of the Seal of Election, *The Lord knoweth them that are his*, 2 Tim. 2. 19. unto every one that as a Church-member, is to be received into visible fellowship; A Church-member, and an elect person, according to this tenent are *termini convertibiles*; and the seale of the Spirit, and the seale of the Sacrament are in equal latitude; To baptize an unregenerate person is to put a seal to a blank, as high an abuse of that sacred Ordinance, as the circumcision of the *Sichemites*, *Gen.* 34. 24. That this covenant is such, appears in that Text, It is committed to man to work, and to judge of it being wrought, to put a seal for ratification and confirmation of it. The Apostles were to make Disciples, to bring men into covenant with God, and being discipled, to baptise them, sealing them, as Gods in covenant; So *John* 4. 1, 2. *When the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples then* John *though Jesus baptized not, but his Disciples.* Here *John* made Disciples, and baptized them being made; The Disciples of Iesus made Disciples, and baptized them being made; An outward work then to make profession of the faith, is sufficient to make one a Disciple, and to bring him within the verge of the covenant.

Secondly, That which a whole Nation, in Gods ordinary way of administration is in a capacity to attaine, and enter into, is a covenant onely professed, visibly entred upon and doth not require any inward change, or work upon the soule to the being of it; this is plaine, It cannot be expected in Gods ordinary way, that a Nation should be brought forth at once, all really holy and sanctified, Such a field hath not been seen without tares. Such a floore without chaffe, Such a draw-net without any fish that is bad; Such a Feast and no one without a wedding garment; But whole Nations are in a capacity, in Gods ordinary way of working, to enter into this covenant, as is plaine in the Text; The whole of the Nation, is, in their commission, where they come, and in many Nations it hath had happy successe, Whole Nations without exceptions (unlesse strangers so-

sojourning) have been brought within covenant. One would faine fasten another interpretation on those words, and make the commission to sound, not according to the letter of the words, nor yet according to the successe by grace attained, but to his liking, and therefore is put to it to change the word μαθητεύσατε, into ποιεῖτε μαθητὰς, and then [all Nations] must either be put by apposition, ποιεῖτε μαθητὰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, or with the Preposition ποιεῖτε μαθητὰς ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, and so instead of *disciple all Nations*, it will be, *make disciples in all Nations*. This he thinks is very tolerable, because *to disciple*, and *to make disciples* is all one. But though they may be one in themselves, yet it makes a maine difference in the phrase, and with the addition of his prepositition, inverts the whole meaning of the words, as to the thing in controversie, which is such a violence offered to the Text, as is not to be endured in him, that is about to draw a Logical argument for his advantage against an adversary. And as it is against the letter of the Text, so it is plainly against our Saviours scope, and end in giving this commission. *This enlargement unto all Nations in this place was in opposition to the restriction*, Matth. 10. 5. as by the adversary is confest. Now in that Nation, to which there they were limitted, the whole of the Nation was in covenant, all the land was the land of *Immanuel*, Esay 8.8. and consequently so it was to be in other Nations, by vertue of this happy enlargement, or else the oppolition is utterly taken away, the meaning of the words clouded, and the Apostles at a losse for the understanding of them; Having before spent their paines in a Nation, all Disciples, and now having a commission for the discipling of all Nations, how shall they understand the words, unlesse the whole of the Nation, where they come are to be discipled? And hereto accord the prophecies of Scripture, for the calling of the Nations of the Gentiles, *God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of* Sem, *Gen.* 9.27. *Sem* was wholly in covenant, not by pieces and parcels, but universally in covenant; *Japhet* is to come in succession into covenant in like latitude, *Psalme* 2. 8. *Ask of me, and I will give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* It is not some among the Nations of the Heathen that are to be the inheritance of Christ, but the Heathen, To which agrees, *Rev.* 11.15. *The King-*

The literal grammatical sense of the words vindicated.

Confirmed by the relation that this more enlarged Commission hath to that which was restrained to *Israel* onely.

By Old Testament-prophecies.

Kingdomes of the earth, shall become the Kingdomes of the Lord, and of his Christ; *Immanuel* of old had one, now he shall have more Kingdomes, and they become his, no other way, than by discipling; Gods Ministers are his men of warre, for subduing and captivating them, 2*Cor.* 10. 4, 5. and Kingdoms are promised them, not some onely in Kingdoms. *Alexander* would not sit down with such a conquest, neither will Christ Jesus. If to possesse some in a Kingdome, be to possesse a Kingdome, then Antichrist of long hath had this Kingdome; *All Kings shall bow down before him, all Nations shall serve him*, Psal. 72. 11. *All Nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorifie thy Name*, Psal. 86. 9. *Thou shalt call a Nation which thou knowest not, and Nations that knew not thee, shall run unto thee*, Esay 55. 5. There God calls the Nation, and the Nation doth answer Gods call. *In that day* Israel *shall be a third with* Egypt, *and with* Assyria, *even a blessing in the midst of the land, whom the Lord of Hosts shall blesse, saying, Blessed be* Egypt *my people, and* Assyria *the work of my hands, and* Israel *my inheritance.* There, *Egypt* and *Assyria* are in equipage with *Israel*, all three sister-Churches, *Israel* without any preheminence; Either *Israel* then was not a Nation of Disciples, a Nation wholly within covenant, or else these are to be National Churches, the whole of the Nation to be discipled and brought into covenant. Passing by other Scriptures in silence, one tells me, that he *marvels that I am not ashamed to produce*, Psalme 72. 11. Psalme 86. 9. *to prove that the whole of the Nation, even infants must be included*, Matth. 28. 19. *As if* (saith he) *it were foretold that the whole Nation, even Infants should come before God and worship.* But it is strange, if he be ignorant, that propbecies in the Od Testament; of the glory of New Testament-times, are in Old Testament-phrases by way of allusion to the worship of those times, set forth to us. It was the practice of the people of the Jewes, for their males of growth and strength to appear before the Lord, and neither females nor Infants, as *Ainsworth* on *Exod.* 23. 17. observes, yet they appeared in the name of females and children, and their females and children, were in covenant, together with them, *Deut.* 29. 11. so that, as the rest of the prophecies, to which he hath nothing to say, so, these two prophecies (against which he excepts)

cepts) ſpeak fully for the diſcipling of Nations in New Teſtament times. The ſucceſſe of theſe Prophecies hath happily anſwered in many Nations, which may well ſerve, as a cleare Comment both of theſe Prophecies, and the commiſſion granted by the Lord Jeſus, though by the working of the man of Sinne, and other Hereticks, the glory hath been much dazeled, yet, in moſt of the Nations of *Europe*, it hath been happily effected. Let any man finde equal Reaſons for the variation of the words, as I have done for keeping to the letter of the Text, then I ſhall hearken to him, in the meane time all indifferent men may well challenge their reaſon that heed him.

By the happy ſucceſſe that in many Nations hath followed upon it.

A ſecond Text holding out the covenant in its ancient latitude, we have from our Saviour Chriſt, *Matth.* 20. 16. and 22. 14. *Many are called, but few choſen.* The cloſe of two ſeveral Parables: The one of the labourers hired into the Vineyard, where ſome claimed a more large pay upon merit: The other, of the Parable of the Wedding-feaſt, where one intruded without a Wedding garment; whence our Saviour inferres, *Many are called*, are of the number of gueſts at the wedding feaſt, are of the labourers in the Vineyard, but *few are choſen*; from whence I thus argue; If there be a call from God in the times of the New Teſtament in a farre greater latitude than the grace of Election, that, of many called, few only are elected; then the covenant in New Teſtament-times, is not to be reſtrained to the elect and regenerate, but containes all that profeſſedly accept the termes of the covenant, and viſibly appear a people of God. This is evident, ſeeing the call is, into covenant, all at the Feaſt were called ones, all the hired labourers were covenant-ſervants. To conceive men to be called of God, and not to be in covenant with God, is a full contradiction. The call hath its *terminus à quo*, and its *terminus ad quem*; a ſtate which upon call they leave; and a new ſtate on which they enter. They are upon this call in a nearer relation to God, than the reſt of the world, otherwiſe they were the ſame as ever, and not called at all, they are not in ſo neare a relation, as men borne of the Spirit, ſo they were elected. They have a call by the Word, and miniſterial outward Ordinances, to which they yeeld a profeſſed ſubjection. They have not attained the inward working of the

2.
Mat. 22. 14.
Mat. 20. 16.

the Spirit to a real Sanctification. Now for the Assumption, that there is a call in New Testament-times in this latitude, in a far greater latitude than the grace of Election, our Saviour evidently shews in the Text quoted; There are those at the feast that are not accepted; There are those that are taken into the Vineyard, that at the evening of the day do displease, there are those therefore that are called into covenant with God, and yet are rejected of God, a full, and a clear Text for covenant-holinesse.

3. Those several Parables. Mat. 13.24, 25 Mat. 13.47. Mat. 3.12. 2 Tim. 2.20.

This is farther evident in those Parables of our Saviour Christ, of the field with Wheat and Tares, *Matth.* 13.24, 25. of the draw-net with fishes good and bad, *Matth.* 13.47. of the floore with chaffe and Wheat, *Matth.* 3.12. of the great house, where there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood, and earth, and stone; some to honour, and some to dishonour, 2 *Tim.* 2.20. In which parables by the floore, the field (expressely compared to the Kingdome of Heaven, and the great house) the Church is understood, which stands in covenant-relation to God, and containes those that are in covenant with God. A man in the Kingdome of Heaven is a man in covenant with God, unlesse he stood in a covenant-relation, he could have no standing there; and the comparison were very strangely drawn, if this Kingdome thus set out, had all that were good, none bad in it. But of this more, when I shall speake to some Corolaries that follow from this Assertion.

Another Scripture, in which the covenant, in the ancient latitude is held out, is *Rom.* 11. thoroughout a great part of the chapter. There is (as all know) a large discourse of the Apostasie of the Jews, and the call of the Gentiles, of the rejection and breaking off of the one; and the taking in, and ingrafting of the other, which I shall presently have a further occasion to open, when I shall speak to another pretended difference between the covenant, as it stood then, and as it stands now. In the meane time this is clear, into the same Church-state, and covenant-latitude from which the Jews fell, Gentiles were taken in, and do still continue. This cannot be denied, we being graffed in their stead, come in upon like termes as they left. They fell from a visible Church state, and that latitude of covenant which did receive regenerate and unregenerate, justified and unjustified. That co-

covenant-latitude then ſtill remaines in the Churches of the Gentiles in Goſpel-times. Nothing here that I can ſee can with any colour be objected, unleſſe any will ſay, that the invinſible Church is there ſpoken to, and not the viſible, that the Jews fell from the inviſible body, and that the Gentiles in their call are generally taken in, into the ſame fellowſhip. Which (as I think) few will affirme; ſo I ſhall have preſently occaſion to examine. If any ſhall further ſay, that they have this title, in *Foro Eccleſiæ*, and not in *Foro Dei*; as to men they have ſo far right, that Miniſters may not refuſe them, or in their adminiſtrations deny them admittance; but in the ſight of God, who knows their unregenerate & unjuſtified condition, they have no title at all, I ſhall refer them to the whole tenor of that chapter, where they ſhall ſee, this engraffing of theirs aſcribed to the power of God, that it is done by the election of God, and mentioned as his gift, and choice mercy to that people. All of which ſpeak the mind of God in it, and his approbation of it.

This is farther clear in that Text of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10. 29. *Of how much ſorer punishment ſuppoſe ye, ſhall he be thought worthy, who hath troden under foot the Sonne of God, and hath counted the blood of the Covenant wherewith he was ſanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done deſpight unto the Spirit of Grace?* Where we ſee thoſe that are ſanctified with the blood of the covenant, do tread under foot the Son of God, and count his blood an unholy thing, have an eſteeme of it, as that which is common, and never devoted at all to God. Theſe muſt needs be granted to be wicked, yet cannot be denied to be in covenant, being ſanctified with the blood of the Covenant. There is indeed a threefold interpretation of this Text; One of the Arminians, and thoſe of that party, enemies to perſeverance in Grace, and they underſtand by ſanctification in this place, an internal change and renovation of the ſoul, from whence by Apoſtaſie ſuch perſons fall. They that will embrace this tenent, may indeed ſay, that in the ſtate of ſanctification, they were in covenant, but falling from ſanctification, they fall from covenant. But this is not affirmed by thoſe with whom I have to deale, and therefore I ſhall not lanch out into this controverſie. Two other interpretations are given by thoſe that are adverſaries to this way, and make it their work to vindicate this text from theſe mens gloſſes. The firſt refers ſanctification, not to thoſe delinquents that tread

4. Heb. 10. 29

A threefold interpretation of the Text.

foot the Sonne of God, and do despite unto the Spirit of grace, but unto Christ himself: Christ was sanctified (they say) with this blood. This indeed clearly takes this Text out of their hands, that would from thence inferre the Apostasie of sanctified, that is, regenerate persons. And if this hold, it, as little serves our purpose, Here is Christ in covenant, but no reprobate or wicked person in covenant. But this reference of the words and the interpretation which is grounded on it, hath (I suppose) come into the thoughts of few Interpreters, and it seemes to be very much strained, the scope of the place being for aggravation of their sinne, that set themselves against the Sonne of God and the holy Spirit. The common interpretation (which is obvious, and clearly held out in the Text) fully vindicates it from any favour shew'd to the doctrine of Apostasie of the Saints, and fully confirmes the point in hand. There is a sanctification by separation for God, and dedication to him, as there is by inhesion and infusion. Master *Dixon* on the words having so fully spoke my thoughts, I had rather expresse my selfe in his words, than my own, putting the Question, How the reprobate can be said to be sanctified by the blood of the covenant? answers; *There is a sanctification to the purifying of the flesh, and a sanctification to the purifying of the conscience from dead works, to serve the living God*, Heb 9. 13, 14. *The sanctification external to the purifying of the flesh consisteth in the mans separation from the world, and dedication unto Gods service, by calling and Covenant, common to all the members of the visible Church, and it is forcible thus farre, as to bring a man into credit and estimation as a Saint before men, and unto the common priviledges of the Church, whereupon, as men, so God also speaketh unto him, and of him as one of his people, and dealeth with him in his external dispensation as with one of his own people. In this sense all the Congregation of* Israel, *and every one of them is called holy, yea* Core *also and his fellowers*, Num. 16. 3. *The sanctification internall by renovation consisteth in a mans separation from the state of nature, to the state of grace, from his old conditions to be a new creature indeed; by this latter sort a reprobate cannot be called sanctified, but by the former he may be called sanctified, and that by vertue of the blood of the covenant, albeit he should not get any farther good thereby; for as the blood of Christ hath vertue to cleanse the conscience, and renue the soul which cometh unto*

to

to it truely and spiritually, so it must have force to do that which is Iesse, *that is, purifie the flesh, and external condition of the man who cometh unto it, outwardly only as the types did under the Law, whereupon an hypocrite in the Christian Church, must be accounted one of the congregation of the Saints, as well as an hypocrite under the Law was so called, because Christs blood cannot be inferiour to the Types, which were of this force to sanctifie men to the purifying of the flesh: Or we may say more shortly, There is a sanctification by consecration, when any thing is devoted or dedicated unto God, and a sanctification by inhabitation of the holy Spirit,* 2 Cor. 6. 17. 18. *Of the former sort the Censeres of* Corah, Dathan, *and* Abiram, *are called holy, and the reason is given, Because they offered them before the Lord, therefore they are hallowed,* Num. 16. 38. *And in this sense all the members of the visible Church, even such as afterwards do prove Apostates are sanctified, because they offered, and offer themselves unto the Lord. But the inhabitation of the holy Spirit, is proper onely to the elect, and Gods children.* To the same purpose *Paraus* on the words, * *The sanctification of Apostates was not internal,* (saith he) *but external, consisting in the profession of Faith and participation of the Sacraments. They were sanctified, that is, separate from the Jews and Pagans in profession, and accounted for true Christians.* In the same sense as men are ordinarily called Saints, as after we shall hear, so, those that are turned Apostates, were sanctified by the blood of the covenant, and therefore were men in covenant.

* *Erat sanctificatio apostatarum non interna sed externa professione fidei et participatione Sacramentorum externa consistens. Erant sanctificati, hoc est, à Judæis & Paganis professione segregati & pro veris Christianis habiti.*

Neither can all the noise that hath been made about that Text, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. adversaries take it off, but that it speaks fully to hold up a covenant in this latitude; and from thence I thus argue: If those phrases, *a chosen generation, a royal Priesthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar people*, be applied to Christians, as to Jewes, in an equal latitude, to one as to other, then it must needs follow that there is a covenant in Gospel-times in like latitude, as in the time of the Law, including all that accept the termes of the covenant, and visibly appeare as the people of God, and is not restrained onely to the Elect regenerate. The consequence is evident, seeing the termes plainly imply a covenant. Here is a covnant-people or no where. But these termes, *a chosen Generation, a royal Priesthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar People*, are applied to Christians, as well as to Jewes, to one, in as great a

5.
1 Pet. 2. 9.

latitude, as to the other. That which God ſpeaks to *Iſrael* in the wilderneſſe, that *Peter* ſpeaks to the Church to which he writes, All *Iſraelites* in *Moſes* dayes, all *Chriſtians* profeſſing in *Peters* time, had thoſe titles, when only thoſe that kept covenant, were at any time worthy of them, and had the comforts of them. Here 'tis objected that this Text is meant of the Church, as it is inviſible; and ſo it follows not, that it is ſpoken by the Apoſtle in that latitude, as it was by *Moſes* to the *Iſraelites*, but in as great a difference as the Church viſible, ſtands from the Church, as it is inviſible; but I would wiſh that it might be taken into more ſerious conſideration.

Arguments carrying this Text to the Church as viſible.

Firſt, whether the firſt *Verſe* of this ſecond *Chapter*, be meant only of inviſible members? Whether the Apoſtle perſwades Regenerate men, and only Regenerate men, *to lay aſide all malice, and all guile, and hypocriſies, and evil ſpeakings?*

Secondly, whether the third *verſe* be to be thus limited, whether the Apoſtle makes doubt in that manner, whether inviſible members *had taſted that the Lord is gracious?* and yet the words in both thoſe *verſes* muſt needs be underſtood of the ſame men, and under the ſame notion as theſe, *ver.* 9. The Apoſtle brings his ſpeech to no full period till *ver.* 11. Thoſe that muſt lay aſide all malice, guile, &c. and thoſe of whom he makes queſtion, whether they *had taſted that the Lord were gracious*; are this choſen Generation, this royal Prieſt-hood.

Thirdly, let us more ſeriouſly conſider the Apoſtles farther enlargement of this honour of theſe Chriſtians, *Which in times paſt were not a people of God*; words borrowed from *Hoſ.* 1. 10. *Hoſ* 2. 23 and ſpoken of the call of the ten revolted Tribes, and in *Deut.* 32. 21. of the call of the Gentiles into a viſible Church-ſtate and profeſſion, and ſo applied by the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 24, 25, 26. Whence I argue, The call of the ten revolted Tribes, and of the Gentiles into a viſible Church-way, is not to be meant of the Church, as it is inviſible onely. This one hath already taken into conſideration, and anſwered. *Howſoever it be in the places in which the alluſion is, yet it is certaine that here it is meant of ſuch a calling as is from darkneſſe to marvellous light.* Taking it, it ſeems, for granted, that there is no marvelous light in viſible Churches, that in the land of *Zebulon* and *Nepthali*, where they ſaw a great light, there were, only inviſible members, *Mat.* 4. 15, 16.

Fourth-

Fourthly, as honourable titles as these are frequently given in Scripture, as shall be shewn to visible professours, why should them these be limitted to invisible Members?

Fifthly, this Text by adversaries is made to be parallel with those Texts, *Gal.* 6. 10. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. 1 *Pet.* 2. 20. And those Texts I have demonstrated to be meant of visible Churches. To which nothing is replyed. Arguments to evince it, to be meant of the Church, as it is invisible, come to be considered.

Objections answered.

(1.) *I argue* (saith one) *from the termes, chosen Generation, royal Priesthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar people.* This is by Christs death, which can be understood of no other than Elect and true Beleevers *Tit.* 2. 14.

Answ. 1. Such a way of arguing would not passe with him in his *Adversary.* As [peculiar people] is taken in one place of Scripture, so it must be taken in all places; but in one place it is taken for the Elect regenerate. If this would hold, much labour might be spared in finding out the various acception of words in Scripture.

2. These termes and others equipollent to these, are given to the *Israelites*, *Deut.* 14. 1, 2. *Deut.* 9. 6. *Deut.* 32. 9. not as a Church invisible, but as visible Members. Their qualifications are often as low as their appellations by reason of their relation to God, raise them high. And setting apart Christs death, I would know how the *Israelites* came to this honour.

3. The gift of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastours and Teachers were the gift of Christ, and the purchase of his death. These are for constitution of visible Churches, and visible members, enjoy these priviledges in common with regenerate persons, to which more is already spoken.

(2.) An Objection is raised from that which is said of them, *They are called of God by his power, and vertue into his marvelous light*; *and* verse 10. *Which now had obtained mercy, which they had not before, which cannot be affirmed of any but true Beleevers and Elect persons.*

Answ. Men brought into a visible Church-state, are brought into a marvelous light. The seven golden Candlesticks, *Rev.* 1. 20. had a marvelous light in their lamps, and yet in some of those there were onely *a few names that had not defiled their garments*;

ments; And this light is a mercy, the fruition of it is a great mercy, *Psalm* 147.19,20. Yea, it is applied by the Prophet, *Hos.* 2. 23. whence the Apostle gathers it unto the mercy enjoyed in a visible Church-communion, which is not denied by the adversary.

(3.) It is said, that *those persons did beleeve contra-distinguished to them that were disobedient, and stumbled at the word; but such are onely the Elect.* Ergo.

Answ. So did all they that *made shipwrack of the faith*, 1 Tim. 1.19. So did *Simon Magus*, Acts 8.13. So did the hearers compared to the rocky ground, *Luke* 8.13. And whereas it is said, these Beleevers are contra-distinguished to them that were disobedient and stumbled at the Word, it fully makes against this interpretation. Those disobedient ones are, those that disallow Christ, as we see *verse* 7. that reject Christ upon tender, that persist in *Judaisme* or *Gentilisme*. All others, not professed Jewes nor Gentiles, are in that place Beleevers, and in all other Scriptures respective to visible prerogative, all which are visible Church-members.

(4.) *They are said to be built, as living stones, &c. which can agree to none, but Elect persons, and true Beleevers.*

Answ. That is left out, in the Quotation of this Text, which would wholly spoile the argument, and carry it on the other hand; namely those words, *To whom coming as unto a living stone.* The Apostle shews them the way, and points out the condition called for, which being done, they are then built as living stones. And this implies that it was so, with some, but not with others. Here is that which was done by some, and neglected by others, and their happinesse upon discharge of their duty declared. I am told by one, that he hardly beleeves, that any approved Writer joyns with me in this Interpretation; But though I were alone in it, yet I might learne of him to adventure, not barely on the interpretation of one single-Scripture-Text, but on a conclusion in Theology, against all Protestant Writers, and herein I should have the advantage, in that few comparatively (I think) have started this question, much lesse have they seriously handled it, minding more what those titles engage us to be (in which there is an agreement of all parties) than to whom they are given, when some of my opposites, dare affront the whole bo-

dy

dy of Protestant Writers, in that, in which *ex professo*, they have to deale against Papists. *Estius* indeed upon examination of the thing in question, appeares to be of a contrary minde, and censures those that set *out this holinesse by Religion, doctrine, Sacraments*, which Authours by him thus censured, may be (for ought I know) as approved as himself, and they, as we see, limit it not to the Church invisible, I doubt not, but that holinesse, which is intrinsecal, is here aimed at, yet all those have these titles, that do make profession of the way of it, and are of the number of those that engage themselves to it. *Gerrard* also on the words, puts it to the question, and determines the same way, but tells us of others, that understand it of common and general election, His name (I suppose) is waved in that his Arguments are borrowed, and have been answered. But on the other hand Master *Ball* (who if authorities must carry it, will sway with me as much as either) treating on those words, *Hos.* 2. 19, 20. *I will betroth thee unto me for ever, &c.* saith, *The external betrothing, by outward covenant, so as God betroths himselfe to all professing the true faith, may be broken, for though God offer them mercy if they will believe, yet he gives not not faith to them, and quotes for proof*, Rom. 9. 24, 25. 1 Pet. 2. 8, 9. And *Zanchius de perseverantia sanctorum* cap. 1. *Tit. de Sanctis*, hath these words, *Hear now what I understand by the name of* [*Saints*] *This name* [*Saint*] *when it is spoken of men, is*, 1, *Generally taken, for all those that have consecrated themselves to the true God, and given their name to Christ, and do professe him and his Religion, whether it be done before God truely, and sincerely, or only before men, so the people of* Israel, *although they were not all truely holy, yet they are all called holy, so* Paul *calls all those Saints, who had given their names to Christ; so* Peter, 1 *Pet.* 2. *calls all those Christians to whom he writes a holy Nation, and a royal Priesthood.* And *Laurentius*, 1 Pet. 1. 1. page 6. distinguishing of a threefold election. 1. *To any function, civil or ecclesiastical.* 2. *To the external communion of divine worship, or the outward Church or people of God.* 3. *To salvation and eternal life*, brings for proof of the second acception, *Deut.* 7. 6. 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. both which Texts, with him there, are parallel, and taken in the same sense that I understand them. *Ravanellus in verbum* [*electio*] quotes divers Texts of Scripture, in which election is taken *for the adoption of any Nation*, and puts this of

1 *Pet.*

1 *Pet.* 2. 9. in the last place, adding these words, *And this election is general as hath been said, nor are all that are made partakers of it, necessarily saved*, Rom. 9. 6. *but respective to this general election, he is said to be chosen of God, who is called to the participation of his free covenant, or a people whom God adopts to himself for a people.* So also *in verbum* [*Sanctus,*] which he sayes is taken three wayes. 1. *By separation or segregation.* 2. *By imputation.* 3. *By inchoation of holinesse in this life.* He there gives many instances of the first acception, of holinesse by separation, distinct from the two other, and 1 *Pet* 2. 9. for one. So *Salmero*, as I finde him quoted to my hand, understands it of election, distinct from that which is to eternal life; and calls it an election to *faith*, and all know that they mean no more than their Catholick faith, which (according to them) doth not necessarily entitle to eternal life, *A Lapide*, with whom my adversaries in these controversies, frequently joyn, is also wholly on my part, in his Comment on these words, so that it needed not to have been said, that no approved authour joynes with me, Let the Reader judge as the strength of reasons given will perswade.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Arguments evincing the Covenant of Grace in Gospel-times in that latitude as before is asserted.

1. Titles given to men in covenant, and in Scripture applied to unregenerate men, prove it.

THe first Argument shall be borrowed from those titles, which undoubtedly and undisputably imply a covenant, and yet in Scripture, are still attributed to all that professedly accept the termes of the covenant, and professedly appear as the people of God. Those titles before mentioned by *Peter* from *Mos*[illegible] are confessed to be such that argue a people in covenant, and therefore adversaries are so shie to confesse them to belong to visible Professours; But titles as high as these, and as undeniably implying a covenant, are given to visible Professours; those then (even according to them) are on this account in covenant with God. And these are all of those titles wherwith the people of God are honoured. In New Testament-

Scri-

Scriptures, which are especially foure, *Beleevers, Saints, Disciples, Christians.* He that is a *Beleever*, a *Saint*, a *Disciple*, a *Christian*; he is a man in covenant with God. But all visible Professors that accept the termes of the covenant are *Beleevers, Saints, Disciples, Christians*; so they are still stiled in New Testament-Scriptures, *Beleevers* from the Faith that they professe, *Saints* from the Holinesse to which they stand engaged, or from the holy God to whose service they are separated, *Disciples* from the Doctrine which they professe to learne, and *Christians* from him whose they are, whom they serve, and from whom they expect salvation. I know some have inured themselves to that language, that those that are thus dignified, are necessarily concluded by them to be Elect, Regenerate persons; It is grown, I know the Dialect of the times, but not of the Scriptures.

To begin with *Beleevers.* He is in Scripture a Beleever, that is, a visible Professour, that puts himself into the number of those that expect salvation by Christ Jesus, So it is through the History of the *Acts*, where account is given of the Converts made by the Apostles Ministry, *Acts* 4. 4. *Many of them which heard the Word believed, and the number of the men was about five thousand.* They that are thus numbred by the poll, are visible Professours, that outwardly embraced the Doctrine of Faith; This might be seene and the names of such taken. They are not all Elect, regenerate Christians, such could not be visibly known: The generality of men and women in *Samaria* beleeved, *Acts* 8. 12. But that they were Elect & Regenerate in that universality cannot be conceived; *Simon Magus* is an example to the contrary, of whom the Text sayes, *that he did beleeve*, vers. 13. and *yet his heart not right in the sight of God*, verse 21. He was with those *Israelites*, Psalme 78. 34. in covenant; *yet his heart was not stedfast in Covenant.* A great number of the *Grecians* beleeved, upon the preaching of those that were scattered, upon the persecution raised about *Stephen*, Acts 11.21. yet *Barnabas* (whom the Church of *Jerusalem* sent to them) well enough knew, that there was no certainty, little hopes that all of these were Regenerate persons; therefore he *exhorts them, that with purpose of heart they would cleave to the Lord.* He was afraid that the work might be overly and superficial, of which the Church in every age hath sad experience; he desires and endeavours,

Unregenerate persons, as to the name and outward priviledges, are Beleevers.

deavour that they may be rooted and eſtabliſhed. Only thoſe hearers which are compared to the good ground, are Regenerate perſons, But thoſe compared to bad ground, beleeve, *Luke* 8. 13. Regenerate men, who alone are inviſible Church-Members, have their hearts more right with God, than to love the praiſe of men, more than the praiſe of God; but many beleevers are thus cenſured, as we ſee, *John* 12. 42,43. Regenerate perſons make no ſhipwrack of Faith; *They are borne of incorruptible ſeed, the ſeed of God abideth in them*; Yet there are beleevers that thus ſuffer ſhipwrack, 1 *Tim.* 1.19. *Myriads of thouſand of Jews beleeve*, Acts 21.20. yet not all Regenerate. The Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 7. ſatisfies a caſe of conſcience put to him by the *Corinthians*, that if any brother hath a wife that beleeveth not; if ſhe be pleaſed to dwell with him, let him not put her away. If the beleeving brother, here be only a Regenerate man, then the unbeleeving wife is an unregenerate woman; So the queſtion will be, whether a Regenerate, ſanctified man, joyned in marriage to a Profeſſour of the true faith, not of thoſe hopes for the truth of ſanctification may dwell with her? A caſe that never yet was diſputed or doubted: The unbeleever is a worſhipper of idols, one that ſacrifices to devils, and not to God. The Beleever is a Profeſſor of the Faith, one in name a Chriſtian and not a Heathen.

Unregenerate perſons, as to the name and outward priviledges are Saints.

Saint is taken in the ſame latitude as *Beleever*, and is the moſt common appellation in the New Teſtament, for all that are ſeparate for God, and dedicated to him. The diſtinguiſhing name for profeſſing Chriſtians, as the title of *People of God*, *Circumciſion*, was for the people of *Iſrael*; ſome do not hear of the word *Saint*, but preſently they underſtand a Saint in glory, and will not endure that any man ſhould be a Saint upon earth; Others will have none Saints, but thoſe that are really ſuch, and ſhall be for heaven. They will have no denomination of a Saint, from a holy profeſſion: But if we look into the Scriptures, and may be ſuffered to ſpeak in that language, we ſhall finde, *Saint* for the moſt part, taken for men upon the earth. The Pſalmiſt profeſſedly names *Saints upon earth*, Pſal. 16.3. And thoſe Saints not often taken for other, than a Saint by profeſſion. He is a Saint that makes a Chriſtian profeſſion. We read of *Collections for the Saints*, 1 Cor. 16.1. *Adminiſtration to the Saints*, Heb. 6.10. which can reach no higher than viſible Profeſſours, and

can

can by no means be limited to Elect, Regenerate ones. When *Paul shut up many of the Saints in prison, and did much evil against them*, Acts 26.10. he knew no other way of distiction; then an outward profession, and so he explaines himself, *those of that way*, Act. 9. 2. We read *of Churches of the Saints*, 1 Cor. 14. 33. and they were taken in, to be Church-members assoon as they made profession; that is assoon as they ceased to be Jews or Pagans, and took them to the way of Christianity. As we see in those three thousand, *Acts* 2. The Samaritans, The Eunuch, *Simon Magus*, assoon as they were taken off from Heathenisme, Judaisme for Christianity, they had that name of Saints. The Epistles wrote to particular visible Churchs, are inscribed *to Saints*, among which, what some are, read both the Epistles to the *Corinthians*; yea, what almost all are in some Churches, read the Epistle to the Church of *Sardis*. *Amesius* judged by some to be of the opposite party) hath these words; *It is most probable, that there is no particular Church, in which the profession of the true faith flourisheth, but in the same we may finde some truly Beleevers*, Medul. lib. 1. cap. 32. sect. 8. The Apostle tells us *of the Faith once delivered to the Saints*, Jude 3. the Doctrine of Faith, as is agreed on all hands is there understood; All that professe that Doctrine are Saints: no other Comment can be put upon it, than upon the Apostles words, *Rom.* 3. 1. *To the Jews were committed the Oracles of God*; Saint then is a name of distinction, to set out those that take the way, not of Jews, or Heathens, but the way of Christians and Saints are men in covenant.

For the terme *Disciple*, enough hath been spoken before. This argues an interest in the covenant, as well as the former of *Saints*, and *Beleevers*, and whole Nations are in capacity to be Disciples, *Matth.* 28.19. that is, to be put into a way of salvation, as sometimes the Nation of the Jews was, in the fruition of saving Ordinances; And the Kingdomes of the earth, being made the Kingdoms of the Lord and his Christs, by a visible profession are Discipled. *Judas* is called a Disciple, *Matth.* 10.1,4. as well as *Simon Magus* is called a Beleever. *Saul* breathed out threatnings against the Disciples of the Lord, *Acts* 9.1. In case you will know who the holy Ghost there means, see *verse* 2. all that *Saul* could finde of that way. He made it not his work to enquire after their Regeneration, or inward work of Sanctification; we may well think

Unregenerate persons, as to the name and outward priviledges, are Disciples,

think he understood as little of that as *Nicodemus*, It was enough to him that they made such a profession. Complaint is made, *Acts* 15.10. that those that urged the necessity of circumcision, *put a yoke on the necks of the Disciples, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear*; and they urged it upon all in visible profession, and not upon regenerate ones alone. Let that one Text speak for all, in what latitude the word Disciple is taken, and in how large comprehension it is used, *John* 6.66. *From that time many of his Disciples went back, and walked no more with him.*

Unregenerate persons, as to the name and outward priviledges are Christians.

For the last of these termes, *Christians*, it stands in the same latitude as the other, where we first heare of it, we finde it the same with *Disciples*, Acts 11.26. *The Disciples were first called Christians in Antioch.* And in what acception through all ages it hath past, is also manifest. All of these imply an interest in the covenant, and these are given to unregenerate persons.

Object.

Here that of our Saviour is objected, *Luke* 14.27,33. *If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my Disciple. These qualifications are signes of Regeneration, and these only that are thus qualified, are Disciples of Christ, Regenerate men then onely have that honour of Disciples.*

Sol.

I answer, They only do the duty of Disciples, they onely are worthy of that title as Christ explaines himself, *Mat.*10.37. *He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me*; Yet others have the name, as we have heard, and the outward priviledges, in order to bring them to the duty of true Disciples. There are Disciples as to the fruition of visible priviledges, and those are they that make visible professions. There are Disciples for glory and life, and those onely are Regenerate ones, *John* 3.3. *Except a man be borne again, he cannot see the Kingdome of God.* Ordinances are granted in a greater latitude than Regeneration. All that enjoy the priviledges of Ordinances are Disciples, and therefore it is no honour proper to Regenerate persons.

The absurdities that follow upon the restriction of the Covenant to the Elect Regenerate do evince it.

Secondly, as these titles argue a covenant-interest, when the parties are yet short of Regeneration; so the manifold absurdities that will follow upon this restraint of the covenant, alone to Regenerate, plainly evince that it is to be taken in a larger extent, and that it takes in unregenerate Professours.

1. This restriction of the covenant, to out shut all non-Regenerate,

nerate, makes an utter confusion between the covenant it selfe, and the conditions of it; or (if that expression do not please) the covenant it self; and the duties required in it, between our entrance into covenant, and our observation of it, or walking up in faithfulnesse to it. All know that a bargaine for a summe of money, and the payment of that summe, the covenant with a servant for labour, and the labour according to this covenant, are different things. Faithful men that make a bargaine, keep it, enter covenant, and stand to it; But the making and keeping, the entring and observing are not the same, many enter and transgresse, covenant for much, and performe nothing; So it is in the covenants of men, and so Scripture speaks of those covenants which God enters with man. There are those that enter covenant, and keep covenant, *Psal.* 44.17,18. *All this is come upon us, yet we have not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falsely in thy covenant; our heart is not turned back, neither have our steps declined from thy way.* These have mercy promised; All to which God enegages himself, is theirs, *Psalme* 103.17,18. *The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that fear him; and his righteousnesse unto childrens children, to such as keep his covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them.* There are those that break covenant, *Psal.* 78: 10, 37. *They kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in his Law. Their heart was not right with him, neither were they stedfast in his covenant.* And these are threatned with a curse, *Jer.* 34. 18, 19,20. *And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant, which they had made before me, when they cut the calfe in twaine, and passed between the parts thereof. The Princes of* Judah, *and the Princes of* Jerusalem, *the Eunuches and the Priests, and all the people of the land, which passed between the parts of the calf: I will even give them into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life; and their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowles of the heaven, and to the beasts of the earth.* The Lord brings a sword *that avenges the quarrel of his covenant*, Levit. 26 25. When the heavieſt of judgements is mentioned, and a large list enumerated, as *Esay* 24. *Behold the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. And it shall be as with the People, so with the Priest;*

Prieſt; as with the Servant, ſo with his Maſter; as with the Maid, ſo with her Miſtreſſe; as with the Buyer, ſo with the Seller; as with the Lender, ſo with the Borrower; as with the taker of uſury, ſo with the giver of uſury; to him the land ſhall be utterly emptied, and utterly ſpoiled, for the Lord hath ſpoken this word. The earth mourneth and fadeth away, the haughty people of the earth do languiſh, the earth alſo is defiled under the inhabitants thereof. Therefore hath the curſe devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are deſolate; therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burnt, and few men left; the new wine mourneth, the vine languiſheth, all the merry-hearted do ſigh. The myrth of Tabrets ceaſeth, the noiſe of them that rejoyce endeth, the joy of the Harp ceaſeth; They ſhal not drink wine with a ſong, ſtrong drink ſhall be bitter to them that drink it. The city of confuſion is broken down, every houſe is ſhut up, that no man may come in. There is a crying for wine in the ſtreets, all joy is darkned, the mirth of the land is gone: In the City is left deſolation, and the Gate is ſmitten with deſtruction. The reaſon of all this is given in the cloſe of verſe 5. *Becauſe they have tranſgreſſed the Laws, changed the Ordinances, broken the everlaſting Covenant.* Now according to this opinion, Regeneration is our entrance into covenant, and Regeneration is our keeping of covenant; before regeneration we make no covenant, after Regeneration we break no covenant, there is no ſuch thing as covenant-breaking. All this makes an utter confuſion in the covenant.

2. Then there is no ſuch thing as an hypocrite in the world, as in reference towards God; no ſuch thing as an hypocrite in the Church as in reference to Religion, and wayes of godlineſſe. An hypocrite is one that perſonates the man that he is not, with *Jeroboams* wife, feignes himſelf to be another perſon, 1 *King.* 14 6. He that acts *Tarquin* or *Lucretia* in the Tragedy, is not *Tarquin* or *Lucretia*, that acts a King is many times a peaſant. Now an hypocrite reſpective to Religion, and in Scripture uſe of the phraſe, is one that pretends for God, and is not Gods; pretends to be wholly his, and is ſome others; of theſe God frequently complaines, Theſe in the Scriptures are menaced with heavy judgements. Now according to this opinion, that only Regenerate men are in covenant, there is no ſuch thing as an hypocrite. No ſuch ſinne as hypocriſie; Where the Goſpel is preached, God makes tender of himſelf in covenant; and in caſe none but Regenerate enter Covenant,

venant, then only they take upon them the persons of people in relation to him, onely they strike hands with him, and these, as they *professe*, so in sincerity and reality they *are*; as they covenant with him, so in the uprightnesse of their hearts they walk before him, and so all of *Israel*, are *Israel*. There cannot be found a man in *Israel* that is not a *Nathaniel*; Men out of covenant, are without, and aliens to the Common-wealth of *Israel*, Ephes. 2. 12. And if they be in covenant, then according to this opinion, they are men sincere, and upright-hearted in it. But you will say, *They pretend to the covenant, and are not in covenant, and so are hypocrites.* To this I say. (1.) It is plain against the Scriptures, that makes hypocrites false in the covenant, men whose hearts were not stedfast in it, as *Psalme* 78. 8, 10. *a stubborne and rebellious generation, a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not stedfast with God. They kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in his Law.* More fully, *verse* 36, 37. *They did flatter him with their mouth, and they lied unto him with their tongues, for their hearts were not right with him, neither were they stedfast in his covenant.* Therefore they pretend not barely to a covenant, but the covenant which they enter, is their pretence for God, and their breach of covenant argues them guilty of hypocrisie before the Lord. (2.) According to these such pretend to the stage, but are never admitted on it. They pretend to act the part of a Servant of God, but never act in it; so we may say, they pretend to hypocrisie, but never are in the honour to be in any capacity of it. *Object.*

3. If the covenant be with this limit, only to Regenerate persons, then no Minister in any Church, no Church-Officer, nor any other Church-member, in case you will make it to be their work, may baptize any person. That Disciples are to be baptized, is out of question with all that acknowledge such a standing Ordinance as Baptisme; It being in the Apostles commission, *to disciple Nations, and baptize them.* These are brought into the bond of the covenant, as *Ezek.* 20. 37. But those only, passing for Disciples, and men in covenant that are Regenerate, they can by no eye of any Minister, Church-Officer, or member be discerned. This is that work that *cometh not with observation, or outward shew, that men should say, lo here, or lo there*, Luke 17. 20, 21. Christ might indeed have baptized in his own person at pleasure, seeing *he knew*

knew what was in man, John 2. 2. He could have distinguished a Beleever from an unbeleever, a Saint from an unsanctified man, a Christian from him that is no Christian, a Disciple from one that is no Disciple, taking these titles in the sense of these persons. So can no other man. It is the Prerogative Royal of God to search the heart; If *Paul* could have discerned false Brethren by a spirit of infallibility, he had never been in that danger, 2 *Cor.* 11.26. But Christ baptized none, but left all to his Disciples, *John* 4.2. And they being thus tied up, to baptize none, till they be discipled; of which according to this Tenent they could be no competent Judges, it must needs follow that none at all must be baptized. If any say, those are to be baptized, that in the judgement of charity we judge to be Disciples, on whom we have grounds of hope that this work is wrought, as I know it is said by many, I shall give heed to them when they can shew that Christ hath said it, that he hath made known that the inward work, is alone the true ground, on which this priviledge is granted, and charity is our rule in judging of it; But I finde Christ giving charge to Disciple Nations, and to baptize them; But I finde him not giving commission, that when in the judgement of charity, men have cause to conceive them to be Disciples, then to baptize them; We finde the Apostles and others in the Primitive-times, making that haste to baptize upon profession, that they stayed not for observation of those signes that might in a well-grounded charity perswade that they were Regenerate persons. And those that fix it here, too ordinarily, make interests the chief ground to carry their charity to a more favourable construction; charity (according to the Proverb) beginning at home, they that are most like to make a party with them, or drive on an interest their way, will be judged persons meet for Baptisme; Of this in a short time we have large experience. As for those that gather up Churches, and initiate them by Baptisme, the way of the Apostles, I confesse, in case that they would make good that they have to deale with Heathens, and therefore a way of more colour than theirs, that set up new Churches, and retaine the old Baptisme, we see what manner of Saints are received among them, such that civil persons (respective to sobriety, chastity, or upright dealing with men) cannot without staine of their reputation, make their companions. And congre-

gations

gations of Saints have juſt cauſe to ſay, that they have loſt none of their gold, but much of their filth and droſſe by ſuch Saint-ſeparation; That I ſpeak the truth, and lie not, I need not to appeal to my conſcience bearing witneſſe, (which alone is ſatisfaction to my ſelf) but to thouſands of witneſſes which may give ſatisfaction to others.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Objections againſt this latitude of the Covenant anſwered.

IT is here objected, that *in Old Teſtament-times, God ſpeaks to all in viſible profeſſion, in that way of compellation as his people, as appears in thoſe places that alreadie have been quoted; but in New Teſtament-times, we finde not that title in ſuch generality, only the Regenerate, thoſe that yield ready and loyal ſubjection to God, are honoured with the name of the people of God, they therefore onlie are in Covenant.* The title is reſtrained peculiarly to them, and ſo alſo the mercy. To this much may be ſaid.

Firſt, if this were granted, that this way of compellation, or ſpeech of God to man, is not found in all the New Teſtament, in this latitude, as to take in men of Chriſtian Profeſſion, not yet regenerate, yet there is little gained, ſeeing as we have found, there are termes equivalent. Beleevers are the people of God, ſo are Saints, Diſciples, and Chriſtians. But thoſe that are yet unregenerate have theſe titles, as we have heard at large, and therefore it argues the Covenant to be as large, as when that terme was ſo frequent.

Secondly, it is not often, that that phraſe is found in New Teſtament-Scriptures, with ſuch reſtriction, only to regenerate perſons, *Tit.* 2. 14. is the moſt pregnant place, where it is ſaid, that Jeſus Chriſt *gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquitie, and purifie unto himſelf a peculiar people, zealous of good works.* But if it be granted, that it is ſometimes taken for a people ſeparate by grace out of the ſtate of nature, it will

not follow that it is never taken for a people ſeparate for God by Profeſſion; I know that Text, *Revelation* 21.3. will be urged, *I heard a great voice out of Heaven, ſaying, Behold, the Tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they ſhall be his people, and God himſelf ſhall be with them, and be their God.* But this will hardly ſerve for their purpoſe. There is no ſmall diſpute whether this be to be fulfilled on Earth, or in Heaven; if in Heaven, as learned Interpreters contend, then it is nothing to our purpoſe; if on Earth, then it ſets out a ſingular glory in the Church through Ordinances in purity; nothing that offends being ſuffered, yet ſuch a one in which yet there is a mixture of cloſe hypocrites: As for thoſe that interpret it of Chriſts perſonal reigne upon earth, when he in perſon ſhall manage all, and work nothing by his Agents, I leave them to enjoy their own opinion, how they ſhall be qualified on earth that do attend him. But if we may make conjecture by a conſiderable party of thoſe that publiſh it, and receive it, we ſhall have ſtrong cauſe of doubt, that all will not be found regenerate.

Thirdly, I ſay, the expreſſion mentioned of *my people, or people of God,* is uſed more frequently in the New Teſtament in the Old Teſtament-latitude, than with reſtriction to the Elect Regenerate. That in 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. with me is plain; *I will dwell with them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people,* quoted out of an Old Teſtament-Scripture, *Levit.* 26. 16. and there it is a National Promiſe, and here, to be underſtood of Gods viſible abode in Ordinances, as may be made out from the context, being tendered to thoſe that were over-buſie to meddle with idols, from which he diſſwades with this Argument, that they were the Temple of the Lord, ſeparate of God for his worſhip and ſervice, and the Promiſe is no more than is made good to viſible Churches; *Chriſt walks in the midſt of the ſeven golden Candleſticks,* Revel. 2. 1. and ſome of them (witneſſe that of *Sardis*) had not all their Members Regenerate perſons. That of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 25. *I will call them my people, which were not my people, and her beloved, which was not beloved,* is to be underſtood no otherwiſe; That of the Prophet of the call of the ten Tribes, from *Hoſea* 1. 10. *Hoſ.* 2. 23. is there applied to the call

of

of the Gentiles into a Church-ſtate and condition. Neither is that of force againſt it, that is objected from *verſe* 23. where the Apoſtle ſaith, *That he might make known the riches of his glory on the veſſels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory.* God ſets up viſible Ordinances, and calls to a Church-ſtate as is there prophecied, that he may there work to himſelfe a people of inviſible relation, that thereby he may make them veſſels of mercy, having afore prepared them unto glory; So likewiſe, *Rev.* 18. 4. *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her ſinnes, and that ye receive not of her plagues.* All Profeſſours of faith, and worſhippers of the true God, are there included in that exhortation to quit *Babylon*; ſo all Miniſters of Chriſt are to urge and preſſe it; Men therefore of viſible Profeſſion, have this title in compellation from GOD of my people.

It is yet objected, *Jeremiah* 31. 31, 32, 33. *Behold the dayes come, ſaith the LORD, that I will make a new Covenant with the houſe of Iſrael, and with the houſe of Judah, not according to the Covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my Covenant they brake, although I was an husband to them, ſaith the Lord. But this ſhall be my Covenant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael; after thoſe dayes ſaith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they ſhall be my people.* Here is a third purpoſe or intereſt for which this Text is produced to ſerve. The firſt was to aſſert an unconditionate Covenant in the dayes of the Goſpel, (which we examined *chapter* 25.) when the Goſpel expreſſely holds out Covenant-conditions, more expreſſely than the Covenant of Works, which is confeſt to be conditional. The ſecond to overthrow a publick Miniſtery, and all private mutual exhortation (which we ſpake to *chapter* 26) when the New Teſtament doth eſtabliſh both. And to ſet up this Prophecie in a third particular, againſt all New Teſtament-light; none muſt be of the called of God into Covenant, for fruition of Church-priviledges, but thoſe that are regenerate: Men in Old Teſtament-Covenant, broke Covenant as is there expreſt; Men in the New Covenant

ſhall keep covenant, and theſe are only the Elect and Regenerate. To this I might have many things to ſay.

No ſuch ſenſe muſt be put upon this one ſingle Text, as to reſtrain the covenant only to thoſe that are ſtedfaſt in it, and carefully obſerve it when other New Teſtament-Scriptures clearly and unanimouſly hold it out in that latitude to comprehend thoſe that are tranſgreſſours of it, no more than it muſt be brought (though there be like colour for both) to overthrow Goſpel-Ordinances private and publick exhortations, when in the New Teſtament there is a clear and full eſtabliſhment of them. There are thoſe that are in the faith, ſo farre as to enter Covenant, *that make ſhipwrack of the faith*, 1 Tim 1.19. Diſciples of Chriſt, *that go back and walk no more with him*, Joh.6. Men ſanctified by the blood of the Covenant, *that tread under foot the blood of the Son of God, and do deſpight to the Spirit of grace*, Heb. 10.29. There are that *eſcape the pollution of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and are again entangled and overcome. Thoſe that have known the way of righteouſneſſe, that turne from the holy Commandment. To whom it happens according to the true Proverb, The dogge is turned to his own vomit again, and the ſow that was waſhed to her wallowing in the mire*, 2 Pet. 2. 22. It is farre eaſier to returne anſwer to this Scripture held out by way of Propheeie what ſhall be, than to give anſwer to all theſe Scriptures, and far more than theſe, ſetting out what is in New Teſtament-times.

2. That we may interpret, and not commit Scriptures, finde out the ſenſe of all, and not create differences in any; we may obſerve that though it be granted, that thoſe that have the Law written in their hearts, and put into their inward parts, do enter covenant, and not break it; yet it is not ſaid, none ſhall enter covenant and tranſgreſſe it. There may ſtill be an outward covenant, according to Interpreters, that may be broken, as well as an inward covenant that ſhall be obſerved. If it be ſaid, that theſe are two diſtinct covenants, one ſucceeding the other; one aboliſhed when the other takes place, according to that of the Apoſtle, *Heb.*8.13. *In that he ſaith, a New Covenant, he hath made the firſt Old; now that which decayeth and waxeth Old, is ready to vaniſh away*;

way; then it will follow (this being the characteristical difference) that, as none in New Testament-times enter covenant, but they keep covenant; so none in Old Testament-times were in covenant, but they did transgresse it; at least that the covenant that then was, was wholly transgresseable; and the covenant that now is, is not in any possibility to be transgrest.* But the contrary is evident, there were those that kept covenant in Old Testament-times, *Psal.* 44. 17. *All this is come upon us, yet have we not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falsely in the covenant*, Psal. 103. 17. And also there are those that break covenant in New Testament-times, 1 *Tim.* 5. 12. *Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.* The Law was written in mens hearts, and put into their inward parts in the dayes of the Old Testament, and some were (as it is called) in an inward Covenant, *Deut.* 30. 6. *The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed; to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soule, that thou mayest live*, Psal. 37. 31. *The Law of his God is in his heart, none of his steps shall slide*, Psal. 119. 11. *Thy word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sinne against thee. Encline your eare, and come unto me, hear, and your soule shall live, and I will make an everlasting Covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David*, Isa. 55. 3. And so by consequence it fairly holds, notwithstanding this Text that there is (as hath been proved) an outward covenant in the dayes of the Gospel. The oldnesse to be abolished is only in circumstances, wherewith one and the same covenant that now is, was then clothed.

3. The covenant then spoken to by *Jeremy* in the place quoted, is not a covenant properly so called, or at least, as Master *Baxter* observes, not the whole of the covenant. So there must be two distinct covenants, one in being when the Prophet wrote, and another to have its being in the time of which he propheſied; one covenant made with the Jewes, and another covenant distinct from it made with Christians, and so of necessity there must be two distinct Gospels. If that spoken of by *Jeremy* be a covenant properly so called, holding out the whole nature of the Gospel-covenant, and that New distinct from the former, then the old covenant must needs in the whole nature of it be a distinct covenant likewise. In what

sense *Jeremy* is to be understood according to the genuine meaning of the Text, I have endeavoured to clear, as in my answer, *page* 105. 106, 107. So also *chap.* 26. of this Treatise, and whether I have answered the objection, which some divine that I cannot, without enervating the Argument, for effectual grace and perseverance in it, I must appeal to the impartial Reader. I am sure none can build effectual grace, and perseverance on that Text (making it a distinct Covenant from the first) without the overthrow of effectual grace and perseverance in Old Testament-times.

CHAP. XL.

Professed believers, are under a Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works.

First Corollary

IT necessarily follows, by way of Corollary, from that which hath been delivered, that no professed believer, that is a member of the Church visible, is under a Covenant of Works, but *eo nomine*, that he, professedly, gives his name to Christ, he is under a Covenant of grace. That a man cannnot be under two Covenants, respective to the same thing, I suppose, is agreed upon, on all hands. A man that holds by one title, if he accept a second, makes void the first; whether his former title were better, or worse; whether it tends to his prejudice, or benefit, thus to make change of it; As it is with covenants among men, so it is in the Covenant between God and man. If the New Covenant make void the Old, where both Old and New are substantially the same; and the difference only circumstantial, as the Apostle sheweth that it does *Heb.* 8. 13. much more then, in those covenants, which are essentially differing, as are the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of grace. Some, that would limit the Covenant, only to the regenerate, and men of justifying faith, as to the just latitude of it, make use of this *Maxime*, that the same man cannot be under two Covenants; which is, indeed, a right way of arguing; from principles granted on both parts. Now they

they assume, that all unregenerate, and persons not justified, are under a Covenant of Works. This, they take for granted, when it rests to be proved; and so conclude that these are under no Covenant of Grace, but a Covenant of Works. I assume, on the other hand, that so many of them as are Christians, though, not *Regenerati*, but, *Regenerandi*, as *Parens* speaks, are under a Covenant of Grace, and therefore, they are not under a Covenant of Works. Here to avoid mistakes some things are to be premised, 1. That many of them have not any explicit knowledge of either Covenant, either that, under which originally they were, or that, under which, through grace, they are. They are the people of God (and therefore under a saving Covenant with God though not emproved for salvation) that perish for lack of knowledge, *Hos.* 4.6. all that bear the name of believers in primitive times, were not got up in knowledge to the first principles. 2. As to their present qualification and condition, they are in no better an estate, than if the obligation of the Covenant of Works, were still upon them. A man, dealing falsely in the Covenant of grace, is in as sad a condition, as he that is under that hopelesse, and destructive Covenant of Works, yea, his condition admits of many sad aggravations, in that treachery is above rebellion, and perfidiousnesse exceeds bare disobedience. They were a people in Covenant, that God owned as his, to whom he said, *Ezek.* 16.48. *As I live, saith the Lord God, Sodom thy sister hath not done, she, nor her daughters as thou hast done, thou, and thy daughters.* Blessednesse, is no where in Scripture said to be on the head of all those that are in covenant, unlesse it be meant comparatively, or respectively only, but, *on such as keep his covenant, and remember his commandments to do them*, Psal. 103. 18. And, if all that were in covenant, did keep covenant, there would not be so much complaint as there is in Scripture, of breach of covenant, nor could men be under that charge, that their hearts are not stedfast in covenant. 3. They are yet in a more desirable estate, and in a fairer way towards happinesse, than those, that are as the Apostle speaks, strangers from the covenant of promise, *Eph.* 2.12. As the Jewes were a people nigh to the Lord, *Psal.* 148.14. So they are, *Eph.* 2.13. Salvation is of these, though they be not as yet, by a thorough work of grace in a saving state. There are of these that shall be saved, *Acts* 2 47. and so there is not, for ought that

that Scripture ſpeaks among thoſe that are without covenant, ſuch are, in Scripture-language, *without God, without hope, Eph.* 2. 12. *under the wrath and indignation of God,* Jerem. 10. 25. Pſal. 79. 6. When the Apoſtle therefore, had ſpoken much againſt the Jew outwardly, and the circumciſion of the fleſh. (that is, men circumciſed in fleſh and not in heart) *Rom.* 2. upon the queſtion put, yet concludes, that theſe Jewes have; This circumciſion hath much profit, every way much advantage, and the advantage is, as he expreſſes it, eſpecially, the Oracles of God, which are the covenant-draughts, and if they were utterly out of covenant, I would deſire any to ſhew, where the advantage lies. That they are in covenant with God and in a covenant of grace appears therefore.

1. In that they have the Oracles of God. To them, that is, to the Jew outwardly, theſe Oracles were committed, as the Apoſtle tells us, *Rom.* 3. 1. They were committed to them as their inheritance, *Deut.* 33. 4. They were poſſeſt of them, in order to everlaſting life, *John* 5. 39. And theſe Oracles, being Covenant-tables, Covenant-draughts, the profeſſed believer, that by favour from God, ſtands poſſeſt of them, is in Covenant with God.

2. They have the ſeals of the covenant. Covenant, and right to the ſeale, where ſeals are appointed, cannot be ſevered as ſhall be ſhewen. They are in covenant, as *Abraham* was, and, they have the ſeales of the covenant, as *Abraham* and his ſeed had, Thoſe were circumciſed, and theſe are baptiſed; and, that it may appear, that they had not this honour barely from man, without approbation from God (as ſome ſeem to hint, in their diſtinction of *Forum Dei*, and *Forum Eccleſiæ*, as though the Church received them, when in the ſight of God they had no right to be received) we finde, 1. That the Spirit of God, in the Scripture, ſtill calls them, in way of honour, by the name of circumciſion, and men may, but God will not thus give, an equivocal or nick-name to them. As they were circumciſed in the fleſh, ſo it was the minde of God, that they ſhould beare in their fleſh, this ſigne and ſeale of the Covenant. 2. Upon it, they had many and great priviledges, yea, all Church-priviledges, followed upon this leading priviledge, though otherwiſe, ſtrangers to the Common-weale of *Iſrael*, now they were look't upon as of *Iſrael*.

3. An-

3. Anſwering unto, and in ſincerity making good, that unto which they do actually engage, the whole bleſſing of the Covenant is theirs. They that undertake the termes, on which covenant-ſalvation according to the Goſpel is had, are actually veſted in a a ſaving covenant; but they undertake the termes, on which covenant-ſalvation according to the Goſpel is had, they are therefore in a ſaving covenant.

4. In caſe unbelief and impenitence in them, be not only Law-tranſgreſſions, but alſo Goſpel-ſins, and breaches of a Goſpel-covenant, then theſe profeſſed believers are under a Goſpel-covenant. This is evident; They ſin not againſt the Goſpel that are not under the Goſpel, they break not covenant that were never in covenant, but their unbelief and impenitence are above Law-tranſgreſſions, they are Goſpel-ſins, and breaches of covenant, as I think, need not to be proved, and therefore it is plain that they are in covenant.

Upon this account, I confeſſe, I have often marvelled why many eminent and godly Divines do earneſtly perſwade their people to whom they ſpeak, to enter covenant with God, giving directions what way they are to take to come into covenant with him; telling them that it is of great concernment to them to know under what covenant they are, whether under a covenant of Works, or a covenant of grace; when the ſame men expreſſely ſay that we all entred covenant in baptiſme; and that unbelief and impenitence at leaſt, if not every ſin, is a breach of our baptiſm, vow and covenant. Might not any think that theſe did perſwade to be baptiſed? and that they tell their people that it is of great concernment, to know what covenant it is that baptiſme ſeales, whether it ſeales the covenant of Works, or the covenant of Grace. If we enter in covenant in our baptiſme, as they truly ſay, that we did, as to the *Jus in re*, then how comes it to paſſe that any that are baptiſed are out of it, and being already actually in it, how are they perſwaded to enter into it. Theſe perſwaſions therefore, and motives to enter covenant, I think ſhould be to preſſe men on to keep covenant, and ſo the directions which they lay down are indeed of divine and excellent uſe. And when they ſay it ſo much concernes men to know what covenant they are under, I conceive it ſhould rather be to let them know of how great concernment it is to them to ſee that they have their intereſt in the mercies of

the covenant through grace answering to the termes of it, and requisites in it, and so the entring of covenant, which is done, as these say, in baptisme, and keeping of covenaut, or obtaining the mercies of the covenant, would not be confounded but distinguished. Their labours would likewise be of excellent use which otherwise scarce suit either with their own words or the Scriptures. It may be objected, that in case they are from under the covenant of Works, and under the covenant of Grace, then they are exempted from the curse, and acquitted from the condemnation which is annext to that covenant, which cannot be affirmed of any meer Professour of Christianity in unbelief and impenitence, and enough is spoken in this Treatise it self against it. To this I answer, 1. The curse may follow upon the transgression of the Law, as a Law, without consideration of any covenant at all, whether of Works or Grace, and it is not interest in Covenant, but interest in Christ, (which these, supposedly such, have not) that frees from condemnation. 2. What if it be yielded that they beare no more than the penalty annext to the breach of the Covenant of grace. If the Gospel be consulted that is sufficiently sad and heavy. If they be put to beare that, nothing more needs to be added to the burden, and indeed with submission to better judgments, not resolvedly determining any thing, it is my thoughts, that professed Christians in unbelief and impenitence, suffer not upon account of the penalty annext to the breach of the covenant of Works, but upon account of the penalty annext to the breach of the covenant of Grace; and let not any here object that the transgression of the Law shall not then be laid to their charge, for the Gospel bindes us to the obedience of the Law, though not in exact perfection, yet in sincerity and truth. And this, I suppose, receives strength from that of the Apostle, 2 *Thes.* 1,7,8. The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty Angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, which character therof [not knowing God] Interpreters (saith Dr. *Slater* upon the words) generally take to be a description of the Gentiles, who though they know God by his Works, yet they know him not by his Word, and to this he subscribes. The other character of [not obeying the Gospel of Jesus Christ] is, as he saith, a circumscription of Christians, according to Interpreters,

terpreters; Gospel-disobedience is then their guilt, and upon account of this they suffer. Had they believed and yielded sincere obedience which they professed, and to which they engaged themselves, they had not perished, and the want of this appears to be their destruction.

CHAP. XLI.

Interest in a Church-state is of equal latitude with the Covenant.

THen it follows by way of necessary corollary, that Church-membership, interest in a Church-state, is of equal latitude; not only the elect and regenerate, but all in covenant (as before spoken to) have their right, stand entitled to Church-priviledges. And here lest I should be mistaken, let me explaine my selfe, that my meaning is not, *ipso facto*, because in covenant with God, and called by his name, to entitle them to the Church invisible, and so to suppose them lively members, living in grace, by influence of the Spirit from Christ, This would clearly enough contradict, that which before I have spoken, and were indeed a contradiction in the adject, I mean it of a visible Church-state, and interest in visible priviledges. If any quarrel at the distinction, as some have done on either hand, endeavouring to take off both members. The Church of *Rome* not admitting any Church invisible, and others not brooking any Church, but such as consists of invisible members, as may appear in their definitions of a particular Church, putting in those clauses, that belong only to the Church invisible: I shall refer them to Doctor *John Reynolds*, in his second *Thesis*, fully bottoming it on that Text, *Mat.* 22. 14. *Many are called, but few chosen*, which yet, must be confest with judicious Master *Hudson*, that it is not a division into two distinct Churches, or species of Churches, but a distribution of the subject by the adjuncts, *viz. à duplici modo communionis, externo, & interno*, Vindication, page 4. One, and the same Church, hath members of a visible, and invisible notion, a more full explanation may there

2. Corollary.

be ſeen. This being premiſed, I affirm, that intereſt in Church-membership, in a viſible Church-ſtate, is theirs, and may be claimed by all thoſe that have intereſt in the covenant before named, an external intereſt, or, an intereſt in the external covenant, as uſually it hath been called. This is a ſure rule, *Where the Covenant is, there the Church is*; and in what latitude ſoever men are taken into covenant, they are received into the Church. Lawes tendred by a Prince, and received by a people (whether they be tendred immediately by himſelf, or by his Heraulds or Embaſſadours) make up the relation of King and people: A marriage-covenant tendred by a man (as by *Abrahams* ſervant in the name of *Iſaac* to *Rebecca*, *Gen.* 24.) and accepted by a Virgin, makes up the relation of husband and wife: covenant-draughts between man and man for ſervice, (as an apprentice his indentures) make up the relation of Maſter and ſervant, now the Goſpel-covenant is all of theſe, between God and a people; where God tenders it, and a people receive it, there God hath his Spouſe, his Subjects, his Servants. Theſe are his people, and all of theſe are Church-members. The Word preached and received hath ever been aſſigned by Orthodox Divines, as the characteriſtical note of a Church of God; a Church ſtands and falls with it; where it is profeſſedly received, there is a Church-intereſt. Let one man apart receive it, as was the caſe of the Eunuch, he forthwith becomes a Church-member, and is to have (as we ſee he had) his preſent matriculation, and to be admitted by baptiſm a member (not of this or that Congregation, but) of the Church univerſal viſible; and upon this account whereſoever he comes, is a Saint, a Diſciple, a Chriſtian, a Beleever, and ſo to be received and acknowledged; This is abundantly confirmed in thoſe parables of our Saviour Chriſt, *of the floore*, where there is both chaffe and wheat, *Mat.* 3.12. *of the field*, where there is both wheat and tares, *of the draught-net*, where are fiſhes good and bad, *Mat.* 13. 24,47. As alſo in that of the Apoſtle, 2 *Tim.* 2.20. *In a great houſe there are not only veſſels of gold, and of ſilver, but alſo of wood and of earth, and ſome to honour, and ſome to diſhonour.* The Church is this *floore*, this *field*, this *draught-net*, this *great houſe*, in which there is chaffe, tares, fiſh unfit for uſe, and veſſels of diſhonour, to which may be added, the *parables of the wedding feaſt*,

Ubi fœdus, ibi eccleſia.

feast, in which there is a mixture, of, some without a wedding garment. *Mat.* 22. of the *sheepfold with kids and goats.* These parables are brought by *Bellarmine* for proof, that the Church doth not consist only of the elect, *lib* 3. *de Eccl. Mil. cap.* 7. to which (a) *Whitaker Controv. secundâ, quæst. primâ. cap.* 7. answers by distinction. *Bellarmine* (saith he) *ought to prove, that in the Catholick Church* (*which is the body of Christ*) *there are both good and bad, reprobate as well as elect, and for proof of this* (saith he) *he brings the parable of the floore, in which there is wheat and chaffe; but by the floore in this place is not meant* (saith he) *the Catholick Church, but each particular Church, in which* (*we confesse*) *there are bad as well as good, and for the most part more bad than good.* And though he makes some exceptions against some of the Parables, yet he applies the same answer to others. Concerning that of the draw-net he saith, *The sense of the parable is manifest.* [b] *It happens in the Church when the Gospel is preached, as in the sea, when the draught-net is cast to take fish.* 1. *All the fishes that are in the sea are not enclosed in the net.* 2. *All are not good that are inclosed, but some are unfit for use.* 3. *The bad fish are not separate from the good, till the net be drawn to land: so when the Gospel is preached, all men do not come in, all are not good that come, and the good and bad are not separate till the end of the world.* And Doctor *Reynolds* maintaining that position, *That the holy Catholick Church, which we believe is the whole company of Gods elect and chosen*, saith, *The wicked must needs be a part of the Church; if the name of Church did signifie the visible Church, as we call it, consisting of the good and bad.* *Amesius* who (as we heard) judges it very probable *that there is no visible Church where the Word is truly preached, in which there are not some that are godly*, and therefore is farre from concluding the godlinesse of all, saith, in his *Bellar. Enervatus, lib.* 2. *de Eccles. cap.* 1. *It is false, that inward graces are required*

(a) *Debuit Bellarminus probare in Ecclesia Catholica quæ est corpus Christi, esse tam malos quàm bonos, tam reprobos, quàm electos. Hoc ut probaret, affert hanc parabolam de area in qua & triticum & palea est. At per aream hoc in loco non Catholica, sed particularis quæque ecclesia intelligitur, in qua nos fatemur tam malos quàm bonos esse, & plerunque plures malos quàm bonos.*

b *Sensus parabolæ manifestus est, sic in Ecclesia evenire solere cùm Evangelium prædicatur, ut cùm verriculum in mare projicitur ad pisces capiendos. Primò non omnes pisces qui sunt in mari capiuntur. Secundò non omnes boni sunt qui capiuntur, sed multi inutiles. Tertiò, non separantur mali pisces à bonis donec verriculum ad terram extractum fuerit. Sic in Ecclesia cum Evangelium prædicatur, non omnes homines accedunt, non omnes qui accedunt sunt boni, non separantur boni à malis ante finem mundi.*

Falsum esse internas virtutes requiri à nobis.

ut aliquis sit in ecclesia quoad visibilem ejus statum.

quired of us, to a mans being in the Church as to the visible state of it: see *Apollonius Syllog.* pag. 8. *Professores Leyden disput.* 40. *pag.* 3. If any man judge it to be absurd, that Christ should have wicked men (who are limbs of Satan) to be of his mystical body, carnal wicked men to be members of such a gracious and glorious head. Christ is the head of his Church, say they; if such be Church-members, then Christ is their head; I shall referre them to a full and satisfying answer to Master *Hudsons* Vindication, *page* 6, 7, 8. And for those that deny any being of a Church universal visible as Master *Blackwood* in his Storme, *page* 65. who saith, *the objector, is overtaken in a grosse absurdity, to think there is some universal Church visible begun in* Abraham, *into which upon the rejection of the Jewes, the believers among the Gentiles, and their seed are to be received; for besides the invisible Church, the body of Christ mystical, there are only particular Churches under the Gospel.* I would learn of them, into what particular Church the Eunuch was received, and by baptisme actually and solemnly admitted, or whether he was still no Church-member, but an alien and stranger to the Common-wealth of *Israel*, not added to the Church. To what particular Congregation, the Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists joyned themselves by covenant; and to save farther labour, leave them to Master *Hudsons* Vindication of the essence and unity of the Church Catholick visible, which will receive a satisfactory answer when the Sun hath no more being in the Heavens.

CHAP. XLII.

A man in Covenant with God, and received into the universal Church visible, needs no more to give him accesse to, and interest in, particular visible Churches.

2. Coroll.

2ly. IT farther follows that a man by vertue of covenant, being thus enrighted to membership, in the Church universal visible, and baptized into this body, there needs no farther

ther covenant to give him acceſſe to, and intereſt in, particular viſible Churches. What the Apoſtle gives in charge to the Church at *Rome*, concerning thoſe that are weak in the faith, that they muſt receive them, giving this reaſon, *for God hath received them*, *Rom.*14.1,3. we may apply to thoſe that make profeſſion of the faith, being able to make application of his reaſon, God takes them into communion, unto viſible fellowſhip, we are not then to reject them. *Is the neceſſary qualification of a member of the viſible Church univerſal one thing, and the neceſſary of a member of this or that particular congregation another? and may one be fit to be a member of the univerſal viſible Church, and yet not qualified to be a member of a particular congregation*, ſaith Maſter *Wood*, *Append.p.* 169, 170. If I ſhould enlarge this to heathens brought to a profeſſion of the faith, and argue their right to baptiſme, upon profeſſion, and by baptiſme their right to Church-fellowſhip in any viſible Church-ſociety. I ſhould finde the Scriptures abundantly to favour it. Of ſo many thouſands, myriads of thouſands of converts. *Acts* 21.20. which were added to the Church, and received by baptiſme, (baptized the ſame day for a great part, ſometimes as appears the very houre of their converſion) there is not one, that we reade, refuſed, but all received; yea, not a ſcruple raiſed, ſave of one only, as I remember, which was *Saul*, when he offered himſelf into Church-fellowſhip, and that not upon this account that we are now upon, but good *Ananias* fearing that he came, not to joyne with them, but to ſeiſe upon them, knowing that at that time, he had authority from the chief Prieſts, to binde all that call on Chriſts name, *Acts* 9.14. If the *competentes*, as they were ſtiled in the primitive times, (*viz.* men that offered themſelves for Church-fellowſhip) had then entred at ſo ſtrait a door, as now in ſome places they are put to paſſe, where a glib tongue is in a farre fairer way to take, than an upright heart, we ſhould have heard of no ſmall buſtle about it; When we finde murmurings of *Grecians* againſt the *Hebrews*, becauſe their widows were neglected in the daily miniſtration, *Acts* 6.1. we ſhould ſure have heard of it, had they been neglected in Church-fellowſhip and communion; But when no ſuch thing can be found in the practice of the Church, after the Holy Ghoſt was given, which is called by way of eminence the Kingdom of Chriſt, or the Kingdom of Heaven; yet they think they finde

exceptions

exceptions taken, and ſome refuſed by the forerunner of Chriſt, *John* Baptiſt. One laying down this Propoſition, *(a) That men ſeeking admiſſion into the Church, are not to be received without farther ſatisfaction*, gives inſtance, in no other but *John* Baptiſt, and ſaith, The Baptiſt did not admit all that ſought it, unto baptiſm, and proves it from no Text, either of *Matthew* or *Luke*, which give us the narrative, but by the authority of *Pareus*; *(b)* The Phariſees (ſaith he) did ſeek baptiſme, but *John* did not admit them, being unworthy; to whom he adds *(c) Aretius*, who ſayes, *They ſought baptiſme, but he ſeems to think* (ſaith our Authour,) *that they were not by any means baptized.* But how eminent ſoever their authorities are, their reaſons are very weak. The Baptiſt reproved them, called them to repentance, and therefore did not baptize them; when the text ſeems to ſpeak the contrary. For, as ſoon as his reproof with his exhortation is ended, there follows, *I indeed baptize you with water*, *verſe* 11. And it ſeems by Saint *Luke*, that thoſe Phariſees and Lawyers that were not baptized of *John*, were not refuſed, but did refuſe, *Luke* 7. 30. *But the Lawyers and Phariſees rejected the Councel of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized of him.* When the ſame learned Authour cannot inſtance any precedent, or produce any Scripture-Ordinance for it, he endeavours by arguments drawn from the forme of a particular Church, the way of reformation of Churches, the relation of inferiority and ſuperiority among thoſe that are free, and ſuch like reaſons to evince it; To which (but that I will not here make it my buſineſſe) an eaſie anſwer might be given, it is more than ſtrange, that when the Apoſtles had by Commiſſion from Chriſt planted Churches, and were to leave them to be propagated in future Ages, and knowing a covenant to be eſſential to the conſtitution, as now by ſome is aſſerted; would yet wholly be ſilent in it, eſpecially when no ſuch thing was known in Old Teſtament-Scriptures, that we might gather it by analogy, and through all Ages, till this laſt Age, had lien hid and never diſcovered, and leave us, by our reaſon to diſcover it, In which we are in danger to ſet our threſhold by Gods threſhold, of which he ſo ſadly complains, *Ezek.* 43. 8. or rather juſtle out his threſhold with ours, denying baptiſme to be any door for admiſſion, at which the primitive Saints entred. and ſetting up a covenant, of which Scripture ſpeaks

a *Competentes non ſunt admittendi in eccleſiam, quia competunt ſine ulteriore ſatisfactione.*

b *Phariſæos baptiſmum petentes ad baptiſmum indignos nonadmiſit, inquit Paræus.*

c *Baptiſmum petierunt, inquit Aretius, at baptizatos fuiſſe nullo modo videtur judicare.*

ſpeaks nothing; and Maſter *John Goodwin* was ſometimes as confident as confidence could make him, that it had no ground in the holy Scriptures. But to leave heathens, haply called by Goſpel Ordinances, to ſpeak a word or two to our own caſe, who are a diſcipled Nation, a Kingdom ſubjugated to the yoke of Chriſt Jeſus, enjoying ſaving Ordinances, and therefore have a Church of Chriſt fixt among us. Here we might lay down divers poſitions for the regulating of our judgements.

Poſitions concerning particular viſible Churches, where nothing is wanting to the being of a Church, yet much more may be required for the well ordering and regulating of it.

Firſt, where nothing is wanting to the being of a Church, God having a people owning him in covenant, yet much more may be required for the well ordering and regulating of it; where a people accept of a King, and receive his Lawes, there he hath a Kingdom, and is a Monarch, yet much more is required for the ordering of ſuch a Monarchy, for the publick weale and ſafety; ſo it is, where there is a Church of God, accepting the Lawes of heaven, there the Lord Chriſt reigns as a Monarch, yet farther care muſt be uſed for the right regulating of it according to his Will, and the Lawes tendred by him, and received by them.

A people in a vicinity or neighbourhood ought to aſſociate according to their beſt convenience, for participation of Ordinances.

Secondly, a people in a vicinity, or neighbourhood, dwelling together, ought to aſſociate themſelves and joyne with thoſe of that neighbourhood, according to their beſt convenience, for the participation of Ordinances. As it is againſt all dictates of reaſon, that a people ſcattered at a great diſtance ſhould combine themſelves in a Church-way, for Ordinances, in which God rules, ſo it is as clear againſt the Scriptures. You read of a Church of God, at *Epheſus*, at *Corinth*, at *Philippi*, at *Theſſalonica*, at *Laodicea*, But you reade not of any one Church made up of members, reſiding at all thoſe places, or in any places at like diſtance. That cohabitation or dwelling together, makes not up a Church congregational, will be eaſily granted; Infidels, Turks, Pagans may cohabit, they may make an idol-church, but not a Church of God, but co-habitation or dwelling together, is one ingredient; Saints cohabiting, that is, in New Teſtament-language, men ſeparate for God, not Jewes, nor Infidels, but Chriſtians, and joyning in Ordinances, as in duty they ought, are a congregational Church. A Paſtour ought to watch over his people, and a people ought to attend to their Paſtour, which how it can be, when the Paſtour makes his reſidence at *Epheſus*, the

people, some at *Ephesus*, some at *Corinth*, some at *Philippi*, and so scattered, it cannot be imagined. We finde seven several Epistles, written from heaven to seven several Churches, all which had their abode at the place, whence the Church bore its name; these are Scripture-Churches. Now, if any one Church be made up of Christians, some inhabiting at one of those places, some at another, a third at a third place, scarce three of one Town, no more than of one minde; here is not Scripture order, which is of God, but an Apocryphal confusion; Exceptions may be taken at the over-large extent and disordered situation of divers Parochial Congregations, which calls for Reformation, coming too near the inconvenience before mentioned, but Parochial Assemblies, not the name, but the thing; *viz.* a people inhabiting at convenient distance, and joyning together under Officers, according to Scripture, is the way that comes up, both to the light of reason, and the Presidents of primitive times. Our dissenting Brethren will have the limit of a particular Church, to be within that number of persons, that may congregate in one place for Ordinances, if this be yielded (as it must be for Churches meerly Congregational,) then it will easily be proved, that Parish-congregations, that is, congregations of men dwelling in a vicinity, are of divine institution; Saints that made up a Church were still Saints in cohabitation, such convenient numbers as are fit to make up a Church, did not live divided in place, and scattered, some here, some there, but were, as in faith, so in habitation joyned together.

Professing Christians upon tender of themselves ought to be esteemed members in the places where they inhabit.

Thirdly, all professing Christians in such cohabitation (especially the civil power authorizing) are to be esteemed and judged members, and not to be refused, when they offer themselves as members; where there is a holinesse of separation for God, and a professed engagement to real holinesse, there is no Scripture-warrant for repulse; Those that offer themselves to learn, are taken into the School, and not those only that have made a good progresse in knowledge, and fit for the uppermost forme. Me thinks this should be a Proposition agreed upon between us, and our dissenting brethren, seeing reverend Master *Cotton* laying down certain Propositions consented to on both sides, in his Treatise of the holinesse of Church-members, *page* 1. saith, *That such, as are borne of Christian Parents, and baptized in their Infancie*

Infancy into the fellowship of the Church, are initiated members of the same Church, though destitute of spiritual grace, until they justly deprive themselves of the priviledge of that fellowship. For even of such is the Kingdome of God, as *Mar.* 10. 14. This was the case as we conceive of those that have gone from us into those parts of *America*, Here they were, in infancy baptized, here they have joyned in Communion at the Lords Table. If they say, they were not baptized here into such Church-fellowship, then they must say that here is no Church of God amongst us (which as we abhorre to speak, or think of them, so we must not yield concerning our selves) and farther conclude their baptism here a meer nullity, and no more than an application of a little common water. They whose baptisme is valid, are baptized into one body, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. and therefore in a baptized estate, cannot be out of fellowship with that body. The late Confession of Faith agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines, not excepted against in that particular by our brethren that I know, define baptisme to be a *Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but, &c.* Admission into Church-membership they then lay down as a thing never doubted, which reverend Master *Cotton* seems to affirm likewise, and I know no Orthodox Writer that questions, Assoon as any were discipled through the Acts of the Apostles, according to Christs commission, *Mat.* 28. 19. they were thus received. I have often marvelled what men mean, when they speak of admission of members into Churches, when the parties of whom they speak have already equal right with themselves to membership, Have they any other, or better right than title to the covenant, and admission by the seal of baptism? if they have, let them produce it, and then submit it to Scripture-trial. I know none other that will abide the teste; If they confesse baptism to be an admission, then their title is as good, that were thus before admitted, as theirs that give them admission. Their plea in both is one, *viz.* birth of Christian parents, and baptism. For those that they passe by, either forbearing to give them admittance desiring, or that through scruple cannot joyne themselves, not seeing warrant for such a way, varying from the way of all the Churches of the Saints heretofore, what do they judge of them? Do they look upon them as men without, and unworthy of their Communion? Then

they leave them without hope, without God in the world, *Eph.* 2. 12. yea, they put them into an incapacity, according to Gods ordinary way of salvation. *Acts* 2. 47. All were not saved, that were added, nor saved in the judgement of charity; that is a comment, as strange as new, but all were added, and none refused that would enter themselves into salvation-way, which they might do out of affection of novelty, at that time possest with amazement by reason of the miracles, under great present convictions, through *Peters* powerful Scripture-applications, and upon twenty other accounts which might be but fits, flashings, or present workings, yet all that were to be saved were added. All the maids that were brought to *Ahashuerus* and offered for purification, *Esther* 2. 3, 4. Were not made Queens, but none was made Queen that was not thus offered and purified. If it be said, they are within, as many passages from several hands would seem to imply, as well concerning such that are refused, as those that do refuse, the modesty of many is such, that they are loth to unchurch all but themselves, then they are heires of the same promise with themselves, and all the essentials of a Church of God are with those that in this way of Communion are none of theirs, and consequently their covenant or separate way, is not of necessity to Church-constitution, whether it be at all according to Scripture-pattern, rests farther to be enquired and debated.

Reformation of abuses in Churches is much rather the work of Christians in Churches, than separation from Churches.

Fourthly, men by Providence seated among those that are thus in Covenant by a visible Profession, and joyning in Ordinances, as before, must, much rather make it their business to reform and redresse abuses, that are found in the respective Societies on which they are cast, than by any means withdraw and separate from them. We finde frequent advice in Scripture of *considering one another, provoking to love and to good works*, Hebrews 10. 24. *of exhortation one of another*, Heb. 3. 13. *of comforting of themselves together, edifying one another*, 1 Thes. 5. 11. *of warning them that are unruly, and comforting the feeble-minded, supporting the weak*, 1 Thes. 5. 14. *of converting sinners from the errour of their wayes*, *Jam* 5. 20. which argues a well-ordered zeal for God, and hatred of sin, bowels of compassion towards a brother, we finde their praise that have followed this councel, 1 *Thes.* 5. 11. we reade of separation from ways of sin, and fleshly defilements, 2 *Cor.* 6. 17.

James

James 1.27. but we reade not of any separation from Church-communion, and fellowship in Ordinances thus given in charge, nor in this way approved, nor any presidents to go before us in it, but we reade of an heavy brand laid upon it, *Jude* 19. *These be they who separated themselves, sensual, not having the Spirit*; yet, seeing things may be so carried in societies that bear the Name of Christ, and Christian Professors brought to those straits, that there is no abiding for such as would keep their garments unspotted, it will be of use here, to deliver certain rules for our help and guidance.

1. A Church in covenant with God, as before, and keeping up communion in Ordinances, is to be accounted pure, where the pollutions or taints are not great, nor many, it is to be accounted a right beleeving Church, notwithstanding some few lesser Errors. We account a corne-field clean where some few tares and weeds are found, a body healthful that is not without grudgings, Christ from heaven gives commendations to those Churches which yet he taxes, *Rev.*2.3. for failings. There is that light in which Errors may be seen and shunned, and rules for discerning things that differ. If custom, education, conceit of Teachers, or the like so dazle the judgement, that the errour is swallowed; howsoever that be a detriment, a blemish, as the Apostle shews of the wood, hay and stubble, built upon the foundation, 1*Cor.* 3.12. yet it prejudices not salvation. There is power of truth remaining, to forme and frame Christ in the heart, to direct the soul in a sanctified way to salvation.

A Church is pure where the pollutions and taints are not foule.

2. Where the Word is received and profest, though polluted and defaced with additions and false glosses, there is a Church, though polluted and erroneous; Where the essential parts of a man are in being, there is a man, though sick and diseased; where corne is sowen and comes up, there is a corn-field, though over-run with tares and weeds. The Churches of *Galatia* have the name of Churches, though miserably defiled; we deny not the Church of *Rome* the being of a Church, having the Scriptures and several fundamental truths from thence, as the Church in Christs time from the hand of the Scribes and Pharisees, though the

Foully polluted and defaced, it is a Church, remains a being though polluted and erroneous.

worſt deſerving the name of a Church of any people with whom the Word is continued; No Church, ſome have avouched, But do her the moſt right, and the being of a Church granted, ſhe is a hurch certainly miſerably defaced, monſtrouſly polluted: I will not rake in her ſores, it were eaſie to name many and loathſome ones. I will only point at the cauſes. Where food is ſcarce, and that polluted and unclean, there muſt needs be bodies diſeaſed, and diſtempered; but ſo it fares with the Church of *Rome*, when the Word ſhould dwell in us in all plenteouſueſſe, *Col.* 3.16. they will have theirs dieted, the Word kept in an unknown language, as under lock and key, that the children cannot come near it. That on which they feed, is not the ſincere milk, which only nouriſhes to growth, 1 *Pet.* 2. 2. But they have their unwritten word, to ſtand in equipage with the Scriptures, mens Traditions made doctrines, how many doctrines do we there finde, by neceſſary conſequence undermining thoſe fundamental truths that are there profeſt? where food is in no more plenty, and no better, it is no wonder to ſee diſeaſes follow.

Purity or impurity in doctrine, eſpecially gives Churches denomination.

3. That which eſpecially denominates a Church pure or impure, ſound or tainted, is the doctrine which they drink in, the principles by which they are carried. Where theſe are right, this is an high praiſe, where theſe are tainted, this is the greateſt blemiſh. That which advances a Nation above all other Nations, ſo that no Nation is ſo great as they, that brings them nigh unto God, is that which is their greateſt honour, and the pollution the greateſt blemiſh, where all is right in doctrine, it can hardly be conceived, but that there are at leaſt a few names, that defile not their garments, though the more the greater glory. This was the caſe of *Sardis*, and therefore hath the honour to be one of the golden Candleſticks where Chriſt kept reſidence.

Errours in doctrine, are either in the foundation or ſuperſtruction.

4 Doctrines, which are as the covenant-draughts between God and a people, have their taints or crazes in the foundation, or in the ſuperſtruction; A breach in the foundation is the buildings ſpeedy ruine, while that ſtands, ſomewhat of a building remains, when that falls, all falls, and therefore

Jeru-

Jerusalems enemies that thirsted after her total ruine, say, *Raze it, raze it, even to the foundation thereof*, Psal. 137.7. These foundation-breaches in buildings may be either crazes threatning danger, but repairable, taken betimes may be holpen, though a failing there is soonest helplesse, or else, it is a ruine or rottennesse that is irremediable, irrepairable. Truths doubted, disputed, questioned, I call a craze in the foundation wonderfully dangerous, not alwayes damnable; the case of the *Galatians*, of whom the Apostle stood in feare, and was jealous over them, through a godly jealousie, even of their revolt from Christianity to Judaism, from Christ to *Moses*, from the Gospel to the Law: These, he calls Churches, the members brethren, though in a way to be no Churches, entertaining those doctrines, that cut off from Christ, *Gal.* 5. 2. Here, all those that are builders in Christs work, that are pillars, or any part of his house, must be zealous, as we see Saint *Paul* was, in this Epistle quoted; who will see the foundation of the house where he lives so undermined, as every day to threaten ruine? much lesse may we suffer the foundation in Christs house to be thus used. This faith once delivered to the Saints is the common salvation, for this we must earnestly contend, *Jude* 3. for this we must strive together, *Phil.* 1.27. Truths denied, abjured, and resolved against (as it was with *Hymenens* and *Philetus*, and the Apostle saw the Churches in *Galatia* in danger) is a ruine, and rottennesse, that is irremediable, and irreparable. Besides breaches in fundamentals, there are breaches in superstructions, and these either more neer to the foundation, or at a greater distance. The nearer the foundation, the more danger; a breach is more sufferable near the top, than at the bottome of a tower, or castle. There are errours of more affinity with those that overthrow bottom-truths, and there are those that are not so nigh, and therefore not so dangerous; Such crept into the Latine Church before Antichrist was raised to his height and strength in his delusions, and Antichrist still holds them of all sorts and sizes; Either of both of these, may be Negative, or Positive. Negative, are such where the doctrine of faith is not laid, Positive,

tive, where it is miſ-laid, where edifying doctrines are not preached, and where they are miſ-preacht, both tend to the Churches danger; a houſe never compleat or built up entire, but defective in ſeveral parts, little differs from that which is ruinous: The Apoſtle, who is worthily ſtiled a wiſe Maſter-builder, 1 *Cor.* 3.10. makes known the whole counſel of God, *Acts* 20.27. and builds not up defective Churches.

Errours have their eſtimate accordingly as they riſe up againſt Chriſt and obſcure his glory.

5. All errors being againſt Chriſt, who is the foundation to bear up, and carrie on the whole work, accordingly as they daſh upon Chriſt, and obſcure his glory, whether more, or leſſe, the eſtimate of the danger is to be taken. Theſe are either ſuch that render Chriſt in an uncapacity to be our Mediatour and Saviour, or ſuch that are inconſiſtent, in whole or in part with his Mediatourſhip; of the former kinde are thoſe that are againſt his perſon. 1. Thoſe that impugne the Godhead of Chriſt, ſuch, that though they give him the glory, to be above Angels, yet will make him no more than a creature; a God in title and place, as are Magiſtrates, not in nature or power; An opinion that involves the Apoſtolick Church, and all Churches in ſucceſſion in idolatry, giving the honour of God, the worſhip due to God, unto him who by nature is no God; A doctrine that will make Chriſt an impotent, and not an omnipotent head, too weak for his work, to govern the world, and bring under his enemies. 2. Thoſe that deny his manhood, as having not taken our fleſh, and ſo, no ſuitable head, but a phantaſtick or ſeeming body. Thoſe that are againſt his Mediatourſhip; are, either ſuch that obſcure, or ſome way eclipſe it, as every errour doth that is any way conſiderable, or ſuch that raze, if not utterly overthrow it, in ſome of the neceſſary parts of it, his Kingdome, Prieſthood, or Prophetical Office. Theſe are overthrown, either directly, in termes of full oppoſition, or elſe by conſequence, and this ſuch, that is either immediate and evident, the truth being confeſt, theſe cannot be denied, or elſe the conſequence more remote, and not ſo eaſily diſcerned. Theſe things being premiſed, we muſt bring it home to our purpoſe. 1. Where fundamental truths are not only queſti-

Separation in ſome caſes neceſſary.

questioned, doubted and disputed, but abjured and denyed, errours directly or by immedate clear consequence introduced so, that the truth cannot be known, but the errour must be seen, and this declared by publick confession, and generally held, Christians are to be gone, here are not sufficient edifying truths, nor yet antidotes to preserve from danger, when they *would have healed Babylon, and she would not be healed, then it is time to forsake. If any man come unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed*, 2John 10. saith *John*, much lesse then, may we hold such communion with them It is said of Mice, that when the house, through ruines is falling, they will be gone, shall nature teach them to provide for their safety, and shall nothing teach Christians to see to their own salvation? When *Jerusalem* was to be destroyed according to Christs prediction, and not one stone to be left upon another, a voice is said to be heard crying, Get out to *Pella*. Foundation-breaches seen, and suffered, are, as this voice to be gone, such a *Jerusalems* walls are falling There is a flight too soon, when care might keep up the buildings, when with the poore man we may save and deliver the City, *Eccles.* 9.15. They that preached Christ in those Churches of *Galatia*, and preached down Circumcision, and other points of Judaisme, pleased the Apostle better, then they that without such endeavour should desert it; so those that had preached the resurrection in *Corinth*, had better pleased then those that had left the place for their sakes that denyed it. A Church may not onely degenerate, but apostatize; may not onely languish, but lose her vital spirits, may not onely displease her Bridegroom, but suffer a divorce; perhaps keep the title of a wife, and indeed be a strumpet, and want all evidence of relation to the Bridegroome. 2. In the case of pollutions of a more inferior alloy, a Christian may be necessitated to leave. 1. When the food of life, knowledge in the word or means to compasse it, cannot be had. In such a case it must be sought, They must resolve with the Lepers, 2*King.* 7.3. *not to sit still and die.* When the *Priests and Levites left their suburbs and possessions*, under *Jeroboams* government

being cast out of their employment, and the lowest of the people, men of self-consecration, set up in their stead after them out of *all the tribes of Israel, such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel, came to Jerusalem to sacrifice to the Lord God of their fathers*, 2 Chron. 11. 16. Being *without a teaching Priest*, they were (as the Prophet tells *Asa*, 2 Chron 15. 3.) *without the Law, and without God*, and there was no staying there. 2. When a man by compulsion is necessitated to give approbation to such pollutions, in any such way that speaks his compliance, whether it be by the civil power, through unsufferable fines, mulcts, imprisonments unavoidable, or peril of life, Or by the Ecclesiastical power in excommunications, when men are driven out, or necessitated for soul-subsistence to go out, there is full liberty and warranty to leave, But when Ordinances in a saving way, may be enjoyed, with liberty and safety, no Laws being enacted for their so heavy persecution, or through indulgence or connivence not put into execution, there the Churches good calls for good mens stay, not their secession or separation There was not a little leaven in the Churches doctrine, in Christs time, errour was advanced into *Moses* chaire, yet Christ himself, with many other that waited for redemption in *Jerusalem*, held communion as Church-members. All was not right in every Church of the Saints to whom Christ wrote, *Revel.* 2. 3. and to whom *Paul* sent Epistles, yet as they retained still the honour of Churches, and the happinesse of Christs presence, so we hear nothing of separation enjoyned, or practised. The condition of Beleevers in the Synagogue of *Rome* was otherwise, The key of knowledge is there taken away, the people not allowed to read it, in private, or to heare it in publick, but kept reserved in an unknown language, neither could they without capital danger keep themselves from compliances in their sinne, so that reformed Churches did not in any unwarrantable way of Schisme leave, but rather were left, They forsook not the Church, but the botches and corruptions in it, though we were never forbidden to partake of their truths, yet we are forbidden to *partake of their sins, lest we partake of their plagues,*

Rev. 18.4. and therefore to depart and be gone, when their truths could not be enjoyed, but their guilt through ſinne contracted, and it is onely their ſinne that we relinquiſh. It is their Schiſme, in that or any other Church, that obtrude theſe Heterogeneal things, and not theirs that do refuſe them.

6. Corruptions in converſation ſcarce admit of ſeparation, provided that doctrine be ſuch, in which men may have communion for edification; If we look upon the people of *Iſrael* through the revolution of all times, after they were a viſible body come out from *Abrahams* loines, we may finde high titles given them of ſingular glory by reaſon of priviledges, which they enjoyed by their call into Church-fellowſhip, *children of God, holy people, Gods peculiar ones, his portion, his heritage. The apple of his eye*, Deut. 14.1,2. and 32.9. *Zach* 2.8. and abundant the like Elogies in ſundry other texts of Scripture, *A people near unto God*, Pſal. 148. 14. the *adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the ſervice, and the promiſes* did appertaine to them, *Rom.* 9. 4. Therefore Prophets and righteous perſons, kept their reſidence among them, held communion with them, and ſaw no ground of ſeparation from them, the words of eternal life being with them, as Chriſt teſtifies in his ſpeech to the *Samaritan* woman, *John* 4. 22. when in the meane time their qualifications were as low, as their titles high, their converſation no way anſwering their calling, but branded to be *ſtiffe-necked, of an iron ſinew, adulterous, a ſinful Nation, a people fooliſh and unwiſe, as* Sodom *and* Gomorrah *to the Lord*, Deut. 9.6. Iſa. 48.4. Ezek. 16.32. Iſa. 1.4. Deut. 32.6. Iſa. 1.10. It is a great contradiction with ſome men, to name men at all Saints, beleevers, profeſſours, when their lives evidence an unſuitableneſſe to ſuch a glory, yet we know the Churches to whom Epiſtles are directed in Scriptures, are ſo honoured as we may ſee in their frontiſpieces, and among them the choiceſt, and moſt upright-hearted, had converſe and communion, when yet they did wrong, defraud, contended aud diſputed for Idol pollutions and defilements, prophaned the Lords Table, were fornicators,

Corruption in converſation hardly admit of ſeparation.

unclean, lascivious, luke-warm, having onely a name to live, when they were dead, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. 1 *Cor.* 8. 10. 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. 2 *Cor.* 12. 20. *Rev.* 3. 16. *Rev.* 3. 1. So that *Calvin* on 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. puts a question how *Paul* could give the name of a Church to them. If we would know what the Prophets and Apostles held concerning lawfulnesse of communion in such Churches, we may enquire what was their practice, They did not leave them, but made it their businesse, by all ways in their power to reclaim them, to work a change and conversion among them. The advice that was sometimes given to a maid, that for religions sake would retire her self to a solitary life: if she were bad, *she needed the City to better her*; *if good, the City needed her*: may be given to these persons, either they stand in need of the Church, or the necessities of the Church call for their help and assistance.

Aut de fatuis virginibus est aut de prudentibus si de fatuis Congregatio tibi necessaria est, si de prudentibus tu congregationi.

Corruption in discipline hardly admits of separation.

7. The same that I have said of corruption in conversation, I may affirme of neglects in discipline. Reverend Master *Cotton* judges, that *the many notorious scandalous Persons, that were found in the Church of* Israel, *did argue the neglect of Church-discipline, in the toleration of such publick scandals in the Church.* Holinesse of Church-members, *pag.* 21. And yet none of the Prophets or men of God, who could not be ignorant of the Churches duty, and their sinne in such neglects, ever made attempt of setting up purer select Churches nor made separation from that which was in this sort (as is said) faulty. All was not right in exercise of discipline, in the Churches planted by the Apostles, some are censured as foully faulty. The Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 5 2. The Church of *Smyrna*, Rev 2 14. The Church of *Thyatira*, Rev. 2. 20. Neither could the Church of *Sardis* be free, seeing that the greatest part, as it appeares, were openly bad, there being but few that had not defiled their garments, *Rev.* 3. 4. and yet nothing is heard by way of advise for any to make separation, nor reproof for their holding up communion, nor any one instance of a separatist given. Those that for many years together, during the Reigne of the three last Princes, denyed to come up to a full conformity to this Church, had a low opinion of the discipline

cipline then exerciſed, of which they have left behinde them large evidences, yet how tender were they of the Churches honour to keep Chriſtians in Communion? How zealous were they againſt ſeparation? As may appeare in the labours of Maſter *Parker*, though diſtaſted by him that prefaced before his work of Eccleſiaſtical Policy, Maſter *Paget*, Maſter *Ball*, Maſter *Brightman* laid us low enough, when he did not onely parallel us with lukewarme *Laodicea*, but made that Church the type, and us the antitype, Our ſtate, as we ſtood at that time by reaſon of our diſcipline, (according to him) being rather aimed at by Jeſus Chriſt in his Epiſtle, then the *Laodicean* State in *Aſia*, then exiſtent; yet how zealous is he againſt ſeparation from theſe Aſſemblies? Having largely ſet out a double and ſingular honour in that Church, (as he ſtiles it) *viz. Chriſts entrance into thoſe that open to him, and his ſweet reſidence and abode being entred with them*, he breaks out into theſe words. [a] *Therefore their errour is wicked and blaſphemous, who ſo forſake the Church, as if Chriſt were altogether baniſhed thence, & no hope of ſalvation left for thoſe that do remain. Let them think upon Chriſt, as feaſting here with his. Will they be aſhamed to ſit down where they ſee Chriſt is not aſhamed? Will they be more holy and pure then he? wherfore do they not convince themſelves in their own practice? they cannot deny but they beleeved in Chriſt, before they made a divorce from us?: whence had they this faith; came it not by the preaching in our Church? and can any one preach unleſſe he be ſent?* Rom. 10.13. *Wherefore then do they ſo perverſly nauſeate the word upon any pretence of blot in an external calling, when they are ſenſible of its divine power in their hearts? Wherefore returne to the unity of the Church, which hath begotten and hath nouriſhed you; if you flie from Chriſt who*

[a] *Sceleſtus igitur & blaſphemus eorum error eſt, qui ſic ab hac eccleſia deficiunt, quaſi Chriſtus hinc prorſus exularet, nec ulla ſpes ſalutis manentibus eſſe poſſet. Cogitent hîc Chriſtum convivantem cum ſuis. An pudebit eos illic diſcumbere, ubi vident Chriſtum non pudere. An illo ſanctiores & mundiores erunt? Sed quare ſe non convincunt ſuo ipſorum uſu? Non poſſunt inficiari quin priùs in Chriſtum crediderint, quam fecerunt nobis divortium? unde hæc illi fides? Annon exprædicatione in noſtra eccleſia? Nunquid autem prædicare quis poteſt niſi mittatur?* Rom. 10. 13. *Quid ergo verbum propter lubem aliquam externæ vocationis tam pervicè reſpuunt, cujus vim divinam in cordibus ſentiunt? Quamobrem redite ad unitatem eccleſiæ quæ vos genuit & aluit; ſi fugiatis hunc Chriſtum, qui cum electis in noſtris ædibus cænat, ac eos viciſſim excipit, profectò nuſquam invenietis.*

feaſts

feasts with his elect in our Congregation, entertaining them mutually, truly you will finde him no where. How doth Reverend Master *Cotton* in his preface to Master *Hilderſams* work upon the fourth of *John* (whom without honour I cannot mention) ſet forth his renoune, for this work of oppoſing ſeparation? of which he ſtill appeares to be tender though he ſeeme *page* 13. of his Treatiſe of holineſſe of Church-members to be over indulgent to it, Speaking in excuſe of thoſe that withdraw from communion in publick Ordinances of Chriſt, when Church-Officers receive in, for members of the Church, thoſe that are moſt ſcandalous and wicked, and not ſuch Saints as *Paul* writeth to at *Rome*, *Corinth*, *Epheſus*, *Coloſſe*, and defending them againſt Mr. *Rutherford*, he ſaith, *But if private members be perſwaded in conſcience from the word of God, that themſelves have due right and intereſt as well in the admiſſion of members as in excommunication of offenders or in election of officers, how ſhall they keep themſelves from partaking in the ſinnes of their Officers, if they ſuffer them to go on in ſuch a manifeſt breach of rule without due proceeding againſt them for their reformation?* and after ſome caution given he concludes, *It is eſſential to Community to have power to admit unto communion, and to withdraw from communion.* To which I ſay. 1. We have not a full account, of the Saints in thoſe Churches, reſpective to ſcandals, it ſeems by divers paſſages, that many in *Coloſſe*, were none of the ſoundeſt in faith, as appears by the Apoſtles reproof, *chap.* 2 20. I am ſure, that if any Church, have ſuch as were to be found in *Corinth*, for ignoranee, Idolatry, faction, oppreſſion, adultery, laſciviouſneſs, prophanation of the Lords Table, they will be judged ſufficiently ſcandalous. 2. If ſuch a perſwaſion in conſcience, wou'd warrant a ſeparation, it would be worth enquiry to know what ſeparation is not warrantable? The error that Mr. *Brightman* brands, as wicked and blaſphemous, is here abundantly juſtified; Church-guides (at leaſt in ſome places) were then, ſo far at leaſt, guilty in their admiſſions. 3. What warranty is there, for any mans withdrawing himſelf, from publick Communion in the Ordinances of Jeſus Chriſt, when he may with freedome enjoy that glorious priviledge, upon

on that account that he cannot enjoy the whole of thoſe priviledges, or actual exerciſe of them, in which he takes himſelf to have any intereſt. Sure I am, Miniſters of Chriſt, in many reformed Churches in the world, have judged themſelves to be overmuch coopt up, in ſeveral particulars, when yet they judged the very thought of ſeparation in this caſe, to be the greateſt *piaculum*. 4 This right or intereſt in every particular member to vote in this way for admiſſion or ejection, may well be queſtioned; If there had been this freedome in primitive times claimed, and exerciſe, there had not been ſo much, in ſo ſhort a ſpace diſpatched, as was done in *Jeruſalem* and *Samaria*, *Acts* 2. *Acts* 8. If all muſt vote, in buſineſſe of ſo high concernment, as in proceeding againſt officers, and to give definitive ſentence concerning their proceedings, either many a meet member will be kept without, or elſe many an incompetent judge, muſt be taken in, many a poor ſoul weak in the faith is fit for the Lords Table, who is not yet fit to judge of the abilities of his Paſtour. All, that I know, that is produced with any colour, is that direction of *Paul* to the Church of *Corinth*, 1 Cor. 5. 4, 5. *When ye are gathered together with the power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to deliver ſuch a one unto Satan for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that the Spirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord Jeſus.* But if it be conſidered, that *Corinth* had more then one Congregation (as ſeveral *Diſſenting brethren* have yeelded, and as to other Churches may eaſily be proved) then, it muſt follow, that this meeting was only of officers, and not of all Members. And how this power is eſſential to a community, I cannot conceive. The *Engliſh* Nation have judged themſelves a community, and yet there is many a free-borne Subject, that never had a thought of intereſſing himſelf by way of vote; to naturalize ſtrangers, or to make them free Denizons, nor yet to expulſe them in caſe of intruſion. The Corporations of *England* are communities, yet every Member hath not his intereſt, for vote to receive into their body. When the chief Captaine bought his Freedome in *Rome*, Acts 22, 28. I ſcarce think, every Freeman of that ſociety was conſulted in it, neither did *Paul* when

when he heard of it, enter his exception, because his interest was infringed. The several companies in *London*, are so many several communities; yet every one of the members of those Companies, doth not claime an interest, in receiving in, men, as free of their respective mysteries; an opinion of such a Liberty, will soon bring Church Members under an heavy yoke, taking themselves to be so farre interessed in every publick act of their Officers, that they may not without open opposition (which is seldome borne) or actual separation, keep themselves from guilt in their aberrations.

To gather Churches out of Churches to make up one Congregation out of many is unwarrantable.

Fifthly, to gather Churches out of Churches; to make up one congregation of Members appertaining to, and locally seated in many, is most anti-Scriptural. It were easie to bring abundant arguments against this practice. The disorderly confusion, which of necessity it doth occasion; The weakening of the work of God in the place where providence hath seated them, and conferred many mercies upon them: The robbing of Pastours of their flock, spiritual Parents of their children, who, they confesse are of use to fit men, for such a new congregated way, that is, to beget them by the Gospel to Christ Jesus; but unfit to instruct or build them: The animosity of Spirit that is wrought in these separating ones, judging them whom they leave as no Ministers of Christ, nor their congregations any Churches of Christ withdrawing from thence, where Christ is pleased to keep residence. But letting these passe, I shall onely urge this, that it is without all Scripture-president, or example, to gather up one Church (as these pretend) out of the cream and quintescence of many Churches. There was much amisse, in several of the Churches, of *Asia*; *Philadelphia* it appears was the soundest, yet Saints they left not, but held communion with the several Churches, where by providence they were placed, and did not pick up one out of all, as a Church in eminence of purity and glory; neither there or elsewhere hath there been found any such practice. I know but one instance of this kinde, that is pretended, that is *John Baptist*, who while the Church of the Jews stood a Church of God, gathered a Church out of them, as is objected, and did embody them. To this I might have much to answer.

Object.

Sol. 1. *John Baptist* set up no new Church, distinct from the Church of

of the Jewes; Christ and his Apostles submitting to that which *John* did introduce, yet still held communion with the Church of the Jews; They were not Members at once of two distinct Churches; of the new, because more refined, and of the old tainted and corrupted.

2. If *John Baptist* according to duty, set up a new gathered Church in a Church of Christ; then all the Prophets from *Samuel* to *John* the *Baptist*, fell short of duty. If they follow *John* in what he did, we follow all the Prophets and Apostles in what they did, All the Prophets till *John*, did propheſie in the same Church of Christ and not any of them did set up new Churches.

3. The old Church-way of administration among the Jewes was then to fall, that present administration to be taken down by Gods appointment, and a new one to be set up according to his prescript.

4. *John* set up a new Sacrament, in a new way which after his days was the alone Church-way. If any can shew (as our seekers look after) that Jesus Christ, shall now put an end to this way, and that, they have a Commission, for a new Sacrament of initiation, then they speak somewhat, for setting up new Churches, in like manner.

CHAP. XLIII.

A dogmatical Faith entitles to Baptisme.

3. Corollary.

3. IT farther follows by way of consectary, that a dogmaticall Faith (ordinarily called by the name of Faith historical, such that assents to Gospel-truths, though not affecting the heart to a full choice of Christ, and therefore was short of Faith which is justifying and saving) gives title to baptisme. The Covenant is the ground on which baptisme is bottomed, otherwise Church Membership would evince no title either in Infants, or in men of years to Baptisme; But the Covenant (as we have proved) is entred with men of Faith; not saving, and therefore to them Baptisme is to be administred. How the consequent

can be denyed by those that grant the Antecedent; Baptisme denied in *foro Dei*, to men short of saving faith, when they are in covenant, I cannot imagine; yet some that have confessed their interest in the covenant, now deny their title to Baptisme; and affirme, *If men be once taught that it is a faith, that is short of justifying and saving Faith, which admitteth men to Baptisme; it will make foule work in the Church.*

Arguments evincing the title of men professing faith to Baptisme.

(1.) All that hath been said for the latitude of the covenant, may fitly be applyed in opposition to this tenent, for the like latitude of Baptisme.

(2.) All the absurdities following the restraint of the covenant to the Elect, to men of Faith saving and justifying, follow upon this restraint of interest in Baptisme.

(3.) To make the visible seale of Baptisme which is the priviledge of the Church visible, to be of equal latitude with the seale of the Spirit which is peculiar to invisible members, is a Paradox.

4. The great condition to which Baptisme engages, is not a prerequisite in baptisme. This is plaine, to man is bound to make good his covenant conditions before his engagements to conditions; no servant is tyed to do his work, to gaine admission into service; no souldier to fight in order to get himself listed under command. But Faith, that is justifying, is the condition to which baptisme engages, and no condition necessarily required to vest him in it.

5. That Faith upon which *Simon Magus* in Primitive times was baptized, is that which admitteth to baptisme; *Simon* himself beleeved, and was baptized, *Act.* 8. 13. But *Simons* faith fell short of saving and justifying.

(6.) In case only justifying faith give admission to baptisme, then none is able to baptize; seeing this by none is discerned; and to leave it to our charity, affirming that we may admit upon presumption of a title when God denies, I have spoken somewhat, *chap.* 38. and I refer to Master *Hudson* in his *Vindication*, whom learned Master *Baxter* so highly commends to shew the unreasonablenesse of it. Here it is objected.

Objections answered.

Object.

First, *When Christ saith, make me Disciples of all Nations, baptizing them; he means sincere Disciples, though we cannot ever know them to be sincere.*

Answ.

I answer. In case I make this first objection brought against me, my seventh and last argument for me; it will fully discover the weaknesse of it, and thus I forme it. All that are Disciples unto Christ, and made disciples for Christ, are to be baptized; but some are made Disciples to Christ, that are short of faith saving and justifying, as hath been proved at large. This Discipleship that Christ there mentions, is such, of which whole Nations are in capacity, as is plaine in the Commission, to which this Nation (with others) hath happily attained according to the manifold prophecies before cited; of these the whole universal visible Church consists as is irrefragably proved by Mr. *Hudson* in his Treatise of that subject, and his *Vindication*; and most amply spoken to by Mr. *Baxter* in his plaine Scripture-proof of Infants Church-membership and baptisme, *page* 279, 280. *Sir, if you were my father, I would tell you that when you say* [*Christ makes no one City, Countrey, Tribe his Disciples*] *you speak most maligniantly and wickedly against the Kingdome and dignity of my Lord Jesus. Hath he not commanded to disciple Nations? Hath not the Father promised to give him the Heathen or Nations for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession?* Psalme 2. *And that Nations shall serve him? And that the Kingdomes of the world shall become the Kingdomes of the Lord and his Christ? and do you not see it fulfilled before your eyes? Are not Bewly, Keder Minsters, &c. and England (till of late) as fully Christs disciples, and so Church-members, as the Jewes were in covenant with God, and so Church-members? We are not all sincere: True no more were they for with many of them God was not well pleased, but shut out all that Nation of covenanters from his rest, save* Caleb *and* Joshuah. *We may have Pagans and infidels lurk amongst us unknown; but they had many amongst them known. In the mean time we as generally professe Christianity, as they did to serve the true God. And are you sure there is never a City or Town that are all sincere? I think you be not; or at least is there never a godly family as Abrahams was? you cannot be ignorant that the terme* [*Disciples*] *in Scripture is given to more to the sincerely godly.* And if whole Nations; yea, the whole Universal visible Church (consisting of discipled Nations) were all beleevers, it were a happinesse, then election would be as large as Vocation; when Christ saith, *many are called, but few chosen.*

Object. Secondly, *When he saith he that beleeveth and is baptized shall be saved; here faith goes before baptisme, and that not a common, but a saving faith: for here is but one faith spoken of, and that is before baptisme.*

Answ. 1. This is the weakest of all arguments, to reason for a precedency of one before another, from the order in which they are placed in Scripture. So we may say, *John* baptized before he preached the baptisme of Repentance; for his baptizing is put before his preaching of baptisme, *Mark* 1.4. and that those that he baptized did confesse their sinnes after their baptisme, seeing it is mentioned after that it is said, that they were baptized, *Mat.* 3.6. and both of these with a farre greater probability of reason, seeing in both there is a narrative of the thing by the Evangelists, and in the place in hand there is neither commission given for the work of baptizing, nor yet any narrative of the work, but onely doctrine given in charge which they were to deliver, which least of all speaks the order in which the duties specified must necessarily be practised. All that can be collected, is that we must in Gods ordinary way of conferring salvation, have both Faith and baptisme; though there be not the like absolute necessity of baptisme as of Faith; baptisme being necessary, *necessitate precepti*; Jesus Christ having instituted it, and commanded it; but Faith is necessary both *necessitate medii*, and *præcepti*; seeing Christ not only commanded it, but salvation at no hand can be obtained (by men in capacity of it) without it; And therefore it hath been well observed that in the words following, the like stresse is not laid on *B*aptisme as on Faith; not he that is not baptized, *but he that beleeveth not, shall be damned.*

2. Let *Peter* where he speaks of salvation by baptisme, interpret these words; *Baptisme doth now also* (saith he) *save us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1 Pet. 3.21. and then explaines himselfe; *Not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God.* This answer or restipulation, unto the outward administration of baptisme, is that which follows upon baptisme; but justifying Faith is that restipulation (at least a principal branch of it), and therefore there is no necessity that it go before, but a necessity that it must follow after baptisme. It is true that in men of yeares, justifying faith sometimes goes before baptisme, as in *Abraham* it went before Circumcision, but it is not of necessity required to interest us in a

right

right, neither of baptiſme, nor circumciſion.

Thirdly, *That faith to which the promiſe of Remiſſion and Juſtification is made, it muſt alſo be ſealed to (or that faith which is the condition of the Promiſe, is the condition in* foro Dei *of the title to the ſeal;) But it is onely ſolid true faith, which is the condition of the promiſe (of Remiſſion; Therefore it is that onely that gives right in* foro Dei *to the ſeal.* *Object.*

Here is an Argument firſt propoſed, ſecondly in a *parentheſis* paraphraſed, for the propoſition I ſay faith is not ſealed to, but remiſſion of ſinnes or ſalvation upon condition of faith. A profeſſour of Faith that goes no farther, may engage himſelf to a lively working faith, and upon thoſe termes God engages for, and puts his ſeale for Remiſſion and Salvation. For the parentheſis, *That faith which is the condition of the Promiſe, is the condition* in foro Dei *of the title to the ſeale*, I judge the contrary to be undeniable. That faith which is the condition of the Promiſe, is not the condition *in foro Dei* of title to the ſeale. An acknowledgement of the neceſſity of ſuch faith with engagement to it, is ſufficient for a title to the ſeale, and the performance of the condition of like neceſſity to attaine the thing ſealed. To promiſe ſervice and fidelity in war is enough to get liſted, as to do ſervice is of neceſſity to be rewarded. *Anſw.*

Fourthly, as for the Argument *ad hominem* framed againſt thoſe who make initial or common faith ſufficient to entitle to Baptiſme, and yet affixe remiſſion of ſins to all Baptiſme, even ſo received without any performance of farther engagement; I leave to them to defend who maintaine ſuch doctrine, and to ſpeak to the abſurdities that follow upon it.

Fifthly, that of *Philip* to the Eunuch ſeems to carry moſt colour. *The Eunuch muſt beleeve with all his heart before he be baptized*, and I have known it troubleſome that are fully convinced that a dogmatical faith gives title to Baptiſme ſatisfying themſelves with this anſwer, That howſoever *Philip* called for ſuch a faith which leads to ſalvation, yet did not expreſſe himſelf ſo far that no Faith ſhort of this gives title to baptiſme.

It may be anſwered that a dogmatical faith is true faith, *ſuo genere*, as well as that which juſtifies; therefore I know not why men ſhould give it the terme of falſe faith, ſeeing Scripture calls it faith, and ſuch as thoſe beleevers, and the heart in ſuch a

Faith (as to an entire assent) is required. If we look into the Eunuchs answer on which *Philip* did rest satisfied, and proceeded upon it to baptisme, it will take away all scruple; his answer is, *I beleeve that Jesus Christ is the Sonne of God.* There is no more in that then a common faith, this is beleeved by men not justified; yet this faith entitles to baptisme, and upon this confession of faith, the Eunuch is baptized.

CHAP. XLIV.

Impenitence and unbelief in professed Christians, is breach of Covenant.

4. Corolary. 4. IT yet follows by way of consectary, that men in impenitence and unbelief, that lie in sin, and live in neglect of the sacrifice of the blood of Christ, live in a continual breach of covenant. They engage by covenant to believe in Christ, and forsake their sin; when yet they lie in unbelief & impenitence, are convinced that they are Fornicators, Idolaters, Adulterers, Effeminate, abusers of themselves with mankinde, thieves, covetous, drunkards, revellers, and extortioners, These do not only transgresse the Law (which on the severest penalty forbids these wayes) but break covenant with God, and so are shut out of the Kingdome of Heaven; the reward upon covenant, to those whose hearts are upright. For howsoever, I fully assent to learned Master *Baxter*, that all weaknesses are not covenant-breaches, and therefore with him, judge it to be their mistake, who in their confessions acknowledge that we break covenant all that we do; yet those men in the list mentioned, having given their names to God, and entred covenant with him, walking in these forbidden wayes, are found covenant breakers; and therefore the *Psalmist* deservedly sayes to them, *Psalme* 50 16, 17. *What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my Covenant in thy mouth; seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest my words behinde thee?* that is, to claime any mercy or favour by vertue of Gods grant in covenant, as appeares in the context; Engaging to him, and thus flying off from him, they desert the

the mercies which they might receive from him. As a wife by adultery, so they by sin forsake the covenant by which they stand betrothed, and by consequence it must needs follow, that Christ died for breach of the covenant of Grace, as well as for breach of the covenant of Works; unlesse we will say that all men by name Christian, and found in any of these sinnes, are in a lost and unrecoverable condition; joyning with them that have said, that there is no grace or pardon for those that fall into sinne after baptisme. That he died not for their sinnes that live and die in final impenitence and unbelief, may be easily granted, and that rises to no more then that he died not for those, that finally and unrecoverably break covenant with him. It is granted by a learned adversary that final unbelief and impenitence, are violations of this covenant, but no other impenitence or unbelief; but that which is final, and for this, as is affirmed Christ never died; To this I say, If unbelief and impenitence be not breaches or violations of covenant properly so called, then final unbelief and impenitence is no breach or violation of covenant properly so called. This is clear, Final perseverance in unbelief and impenitence is no more, then a continuance of the same posture or state of Soul God-ward, in which they before stood, in impenitence or unbelief; As Perseverance in faith and repentance, is the continuance of faith and repentance. If then final unbelief and impenitence be a breach of the covenant of grace, then all unbelief and impenitence, denominating a man, an unbeleeving and impenitent person, is a breach of covenant likewise.

CHAP. XLV.

The question stated concerning the Birth-Priviledge of the issue of Beleevers.

A Fourth difference supposed to be (and assigned by some) between the first and second covenant is, *That the first Covenant was in that latitude to comprize, not alone unregenerate men professing the worship of the true God, but the whole of the seed of*

The fourth supposed difference between the Old and New covenant.

of those that made such profession. But the second covenant is entred personally, and so vested in them that make actually profession of it, that it is terminated in them, and none of their seed are taken in with them. Here I cannot be so clear in my method as in the former, some have so mudded the way, that it is not easie to proceed in any faire and cleare order; As to the latter branch (concerning the New Covenant) their opinion is fully and clearly enough held out. All beleevers according to them are in covenant, and onely those that actually beleeve; They entitle themselves, but cannot intereſt their seed in any title to it. But as to the first Covenant some make it to consist meerly of carnal promises, and Circumcision they answerably make a carnal badge, and so their opinion is clear, that the first descends to posterity, but not the second. The seed is included in the first carnal covenant, but excluded from the second. But one undertaking a full Comment upon those words of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17.7. *I will be a God to thee and thy seed*, distinguishes of the seed of *Abraham*, and saith it is many wayes so called, and by his distinction instead of clearing much darkens the th ng in question.

Distinction of the seed of *Abraham* examined.

1. *Christ is called the seed of* Abraham *by excellency*, Gal. 3. 16.

2. *All the Elect*, Rom. 9. 7. *all Beleevers*, Rom. 4. 11, 12, 16, 17, 18. *are called the seed of* Abraham, *that is, the spiritual seed.*

3. *There was a natural seed of* Abraham *to whom the inheritance did accrue, this was* Isaac, Gen 21.12.

4. *A natural seed, whether lawful, as the sons of* Keturah, *or base, as* Ishmael *to whom the inheritance belonged not*, Gen. 15.5. Here by the way he much mistakes himself.

(1.) In casting *Ishmael* out of Covenant, in that manner that all the time of his Circumcision he had not any title to it; as afterwards he more fully explaines himself, to that end that he might make (were it possible) the Covenant and the Seale distinct of themselves, without any relation one to the other, Conceiving some to be sealed, that were never in Covenant; and some to be in Covenant that were never sealed. But *Ishmael* was in covenant, as was *Esau* also at his Circumcision, and his circumcision (were there no more arguments) doth witnesse it, *Gen.* 17.11. *Ye shall Circumcise the flesh of your fore-skin, and it shall be a token*

token of the Covenant between me and you. Circumcision was bottomed on the Command, we grant, had there been no institution, no man might have presumed to have signed it with such a Seale, but the Command had relation to the Covenant; Men in Covenant were the *adequate* subject of Circumcision, and are of Baptisme; *Gen.* 17. 9, 10. God said to *Abraham*, *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my Covenant which you shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every man-childe among you shall be circumcised.* He was indeed after cast out, with his seed, as was *Esau*; not by a Church-censure, as Master *Cotton* affirmes, *Holinesse of Church-Members*, Church-censures, fall not so heavy as to reach all posterity, but by divine prerogative as the Apostle, *Rom.* 9. abundantly declares. His casting out sufficiently argues that he was once in, and when he received the token of the covenant, he was in covenant.

(2.) He does ill, in laying upon *Ishmael* the brand of bastardy, as though he were a sonne of whoredomes to faithful *Abraham*; Concubines in Scripture have the name of wives, and their seed was ever accounted legitimate; neither will this serve his purpose at all to argue *Ishmael* out of Covenant. It was the case of *Dan* and *Nepthali*, *Gad* and *Asher*, (out of whose loines a considerable part of Gods Covenant-people did issue) as well as *Ishmaels*. And could he fasten that ignominy on *Abraham*, and *Ishmael*, to make it an illegitimate issue; yet this would not cast *Ishmael* out of covenant. It was the case of *Pharez*, *Zarah*, *Jephthah*, and yet they were all in Covenant with God. 2. He makes application of this distinction, and saith, *Of the three former kinds of* Abrahams seed *the promise recited is meant, but in a different manner thus: That God promiseth he will be a God to Christ, imparting in him blessings to all the Nations of the earth, to the spiritual seed of* Abraham *in Evangelical benefits to the natural seed inheriting in domestick and political benefits.* So that it evidently appeares, that he casts out all the natural seed of *Abraham*, (legitimate or base, as he calls them, inheriting or not inheriting) from any title to that Covenant, save in domestick and political benefits. Here I shall undertake a Position in full opposition, that *that Covenant in those words expresst; I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generati-*

ons for an everlaſting Covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy ſeed after thee, Gen 17.7. *in their fulleſt latitude, as they are there ſpoken, in the largeſt comprehenſion (which according to Scripture they can be taken) are entred with all the natural ſeed of* Abraham, *by* Iſaac *and* Jacob. But before I come to the confirmation of it (which is a matter of eaſe, if any) give me leave, (as well for the help of the Reader, as ſatisfaction of the Adverſary,) to premiſe ſome things to avoid all miſunderſtandings being neceſſitated to it, by the foul miſcarriage of ſome in their ſtating of this queſtion.

Poſitions premiſed for a right underſtanding of the queſtion.

All the natural ſeed of *Abraham* is not in Covenant, but onely the ſeed by promiſe.

Firſt, we take not in all the natural ſeed of *Abraham*, as the Poſition plainly expreſſeth, but the ſeed by promiſe which I underſtand not of the Elect, or Regenerate ſeed; but of that ſeed which God by miracle (according to promiſe) gave to *Abraham* by *Sarah*, when ſhe was paſt years of child-bearing. The natural poſterity (which was the birth by Promiſe) we only underſtand; And ſo the Apoſtle explaines it, *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Neither becauſe they are the ſeed of* Abraham, *are they all children; but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called. That is, they which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God; but the children of the Promiſe are counted for the ſeed:* Where [children of God] is taken in the ſame latitude as [Adoption] *ver.* 4 comprizing all the viſible body of the Jewes, as it is alſo taken, *Deut.* 14.1. Only thoſe that are borne by Promiſe are included, and all the ſonnes of *Iſhmael* and *Keturah*, (though their parents were once in Covenant) are by Gods ſpecial command ſhut out. Neither are all theſe included; for as God caſt off *Iſhmael* and his ſeed, ſo he alſo caſt out *Eſau*, and his poſterity, Therfore the Apoſtle having brought the former diſtinction of ſeeds, reſts not there, but addes, *verſe* 10, 11, 12, 13. *And not only this, but when* Rebecca *alſo had conceived by one, even by our Father* Iſaac; *for the children being not yet borne, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand, not of works, but of him that calleth. It was ſaid unto her, the elder ſhall ſerve the younger, as it is written;* Jacob *have I loved, but* Eſau *have I hated.* And therefore the denomination of the ſeed, is, in *Jacob*, ſirnamed *Iſrael*; Therefore when the head, or if you will, the root of the covenant, is mentioned in Scripture, it is not barely *Abraham*, but *Abraham* and *Iſaac*, to exclude all *Abrahams* ſeed of any

o.

other line; not barely *Abraham* and *Isaac*, but *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*. The natural seed of *Jacob*, then (not according to ours, but Gods own limits) is included in that covenant, in the full latitude and extent of it.

The Covenant was entred of God with *Abraham* as accepting the termes of it for himself and his natural issue.

Secondly, we do not say that this covenant was entred with *Abraham* as a natural Father, nor his seed comprehended as natural children, we well know that *quâ tale* is *omne*, then all natural parents were in Covenant, in that they had natural children, and all natural children were in Covenant, because they were the natural issue of their parents. *Abrahams* Father was a natural father, and *Abraham* was his natural son, yet neither of them, upon that account were in covenant, we say it was entred with *Abraham*, accepting the termes of it from God, for himself, and his natural issue, all his natural issue, not by God himself excluded were in covenant, He that made the covenant (according to his good pleasure) might put limits to it; *Abraham* may be considered, 1. *As a man*, the Son of *Terah*, of the race of *Adam*. 2. *As accepting of Gods call*, and receiving his tender for him and his. 3. *As a faithful and an upright man*, regenerate and stedfast in covenant. It is not as man that God enters covenant in this latitude, for *Abraham* himself was not thus in covenant, If he had been in covenant, as a man, then no man had been out of covenant: Neither is it as an upright man before God, and keeping covenant, for those of his posterity, whose hearts were not stedfast, were in covenant, and did hand it over to their seed, But as a professour of the Faith accepting the covenant, taking God for his God, in contradistinction to false gods, he accepted it for himself and for his seed, his natural posterity. And all that profesſe the faith hold in the like tenure, are in covenant, and have the covenant; not vested in their own persons only, but enlarged to posterity.

The Covenant entitles to spiritual mercies, and life eternal upon Gods termes and condition.

Thirdly, we entitle the seed of *Abraham*, as before, to spiritual mercies, and so the seed of all that hold in the tenure of *Abraham* to saving grace and life eternal; not by an absolute conveyance, infallibly to inherit, we know, *though Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant only shall be saved*, Rom. 9. 27. but upon Gods termes, and conditions in the Gospel held out of God to his people. Salvation is made over by vertue of covenant, to all thus in covenant, in that sense, as Christ speaks, *John* 4. 22. *Salvation*

is of the Jews. In that ſenſe as Chriſt uſeth it of *Zacheus* family; *This day is ſalvation come this houſe*, Luke 19. 9. In that ſenſe as the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* ſpeaks of it, where he ſets out the danger of *neglecting ſo great ſalvation*, Heb. 2. 3. In that ſenſe (as I conceive) the Apoſtle ſpeaks of it, where he ſaith, that upon the cal of the Jews, *All Iſrael ſhall be ſaved*, Rom. 11. 26. They ſhall enjoy thoſe priviledges, in which ſalvation upon Gods terms may be obtained, and this is all that can by any means be ſqueezed out of their words, that ſay, the covenant of Grace was made of God, with *Abraham* and his natural ſeed, or with beleevers and their ſeed. It is even irkſome to read the large buſineſſe that is made, to find out our meaning about the covenant of God made with *Abraham* and his ſeed; and we muſt *per force* confeſſe that we mean it of a covenant, infallibly, abſolutely, to conferre grace, and conſequently ſalvation. To be ſo in Covenant, as that a man cannot fall from it. To this end, words of mine are produced, that I never uttered, and ſeveral arguments produced, againſt this ſuppoſed tenent and authorities multiplied out of Proteſtant Writers, *Beza*, *Twiſſe*, *Wallæus*, *The Annotations on the Bible*, *Ames*, *Paræus*, *Downham*. I am content that all theſe Worthies ſhall ſtill ſtand up in their honour, and that this ſhadow ſhould fall with ſhame, as well as I am that *Bellarmine*, *Stapleton*, *a Lapide*, *Becanus*, *Eſtius* ſhould fall with it, whoſe arguments in this controverſie one after other have been brought againſt me. To draw all up towards a concluſion, All that is neceſſarily included in Gods entrance of covenant with a people, engaging to be their God, and taking them for his people; is here by this grand Charter of Heaven made over to *Abraham* and his natural iſſue by *Iſaac* and *Jacob*. All their poſterity are branches of this root by nature ſimply conſidered, and they are holy branches by vertue of this covenant, which neceſſarily implies priviledge of Ordinances, the fruition of Gods Oracles, which are his covenant-draughts; without which no people are in Covenant, but all are ſtrangers: And this priviledge of Ordinances implies alſo all Priviledges, leading to, and accompanying ſalvation, and ſalvation it ſelf upon Gods terms, in his word revealed: and ſo before the diſputation, the Reader hath my ſuppoſition.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVI.

Arguments concluding the natural issue of Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob *to be taken into Covenant.*

The natural issue of *Abraham* possest the land of *Canaan*

MY first Argument is taken from the addition annext to this covenant in the words immediately following. The Lord having made a covenant in full words with *Abraham* and his seed, he addes, *and I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of* Canaan *for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.* That seed of *Abraham* that had possession of the land of *Canaan*, through the gift, and by vertue of the promise of God, is the seed here taken into covenant, to have the Lord for their God. This is so plaine, that nothing can be plainer to any that read the words. But the natural seed of *Abraham*, all the seed of *Jacob* in their several Tribes, (according as God set them their bounds) inherited the land of *Canaan*, which is called the land of their inheritance, and not onely the spiritual seed Regenerate. Look into the History of of Scripture, who those were that inherited *Canaan*, and you may see who were in this covenant; The natural seed were there, and not only the spiritual, Even those of *Abrahams* posterity *that died, not having obtained the promises*, Heb. 11. 13. that only sojourned in *Canaan*, and were never possest of it, had title to it. It was theirs in reversion, though they never came into actual possession.

Had the seal of Circumcision.

My next Argument is drawn from the Seale that is annext in the words immediately following this additional promise, *ver.* 9, 10, 11. *And God said unto* Abraham, *thou shalt keep my covenant therfore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my Covenant which you shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-childe among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your fore-skin, and it shall be a token of the Covenant betwixt me and you.* They that had the signe and seale of the covenant, that had it by divine appointment, were a people in Covenant. This is so plaine, that nothing can be more plaine; God doth not enter covenant with one, and give

the ſigne and ſeal to another: but all the natural ſeed of *Abraham* by *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, had the ſeal, *viz.* all the males, all thoſe that were in a capacity of it, it was not limitted to the ſpiritual ſeed. There had been no place for that diſtinction of Circumciſion in the fleſh, and Circumciſion of the heart; if none muſt be circumciſed in fleſh, but thoſe that are circumciſed in heart.

Were owned of God as his people.

My third Argument is drawn from the Comment that God himſelf makes of this covenant, in the whole *Series* of Scripture-hiſtory, holding it out every where in this way of tenure, to *Abraham* and his natural iſſue, as before; Where God himſelf ſpeaks to the whole body of *Iſrael* when they were newly come up out of the land of *Egypt*, he ſayes, *I am the Lord your God*, Exod. 20 2. Deut. 5.6. God owned all of that whole people as his, all of them being *Abrahams* natural iſſue, yet all of them were not ſpiritual, and while they were in *Egypt*, God ſpeaks of them all in community as his; *Let my people go, that they may hold a feaſt unto me in the wilderneſſe*, Exod. 5.1. We ſee the titles that he gives them, *Children of the Lord your God, an holy People, a peculiar People above all Nations*, Deut. 14.1,2. That ſpeech of the Lord to *Iſrael*, Amos 3. 1, 2. is very full to our purpoſe: *Heare ye the Word of the Lord that he hath ſpoken againſt you, O children of* Iſrael, *againſt the whole family which I brought up from the land of* Egypt, *ſaying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will puniſh you for all your iniquities.* Every one that deſcended from *Jacob*, the whole of the family that came out of *Egypt*, were a ſelect people to God in covenant; He was according to the termes of that Covenant, *their God.* There is not a place, where God calls them by the name of his people (which are almoſt endleſſe;) but there we have this confirmed, that that people were the Lords by vertue of this grant made to *Abraham* and his ſeed.

Pleaded their intereſt in the Covenant for obtaining of mercy.

In the fourth place, I argue from the practice of the people of God, making this Covenant of God entred with *Abraham* and his ſeed, a plea to obtaine mercy from God for all *Iſrael*, the worſt of *Iſrael*, in their loweſt ſtate and condition, *Deut.* 9.26, 27. *O Lord God, deſtroy not thy people and thine inheritance, which thou haſt redeemed through thy greatneſſe, which thou haſt brought forth out of* Egypt *with a mighty hand. Remember thy ſervants* A-

bra-

braham, Isaac *and* Jacob, *look not unto the stubbornesse of this people, nor to their wickednesse, nor to their sinne.* If this Divinity had been then known, *Moses* might have been sent away with this answer; *That he spake for dogges, and not for children; not for* Israel, *but for aliens and strangers to the Common-wealth of* Israel. But as this and the like requests of the people of God were made in faith, so they prevailed with God; *Moses* there urges, *They are thy people, and thine inheritance,* verse 29. as doth the Church, Isa. 64. 9. *Be not wroth very sore, O Lord, neither remember iniquity for ever; behold, see, we beseech thee, we are all thy people;* and *Moses* petition takes as the History shews, *Exod.* 32. 14. *And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people;* yea, when God vouchsafes mercy to his people thus in covenant, *Levit.* 26. 42. it is upon this account of the Covenant; *Then will I remember my Covenant with* Jacob, *and also my Covenant with* Isaac, *and also my covenant with* Abraham *will I remember, and I will remember the land,* Lev. 26. 42. And appearing for the deliverance of *Israel* out of their hard and pressing bondage; he saith to *Moses, I am the God of thy Father, the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Isaac, *and the God of* Jacob, *Exod.* 3. 6. and that to stay up his faith in confidence of deliverance.

To this here in this place delivered one replies, *The Covenant* (saith he) *with* Abraham *and his seed I finde,* Gen. 17. 7. *and the urging of this covenant I deny not,* Exod. 32. 13. Deut. 9. 27. Lev. 26. 42. Exod. 3. 6. *And though I say not that it contained only the promise of* Canaan, *but grant it contained the Promise of Redemption by Christ,* Luke 1. 17. *yet I like not* Chamiers *saying, to call the Promise of* Canaan *an appendant to the covenant, sith the Holy Ghost me thinks speaks otherwise,* Psalme 105. 8, 9. 10, 11. *Object.*

I shall say no more, but leave it to the Reader, whether this be any answer, only for his censure of *Chamiers* calling the promise of the land of *Canaan* an appendant to this covenant; the thing is so clear in the narrative of it, *Gen.* 17. that nothing can be more evident. The Covenant is full, *vers.* 7. *To be a God to* Abraham *and to his seed,* and this he might have been had he pleased, in the land of *Ur* of the *Caldees*, or in any land whatsoever where *Abrahams* seed had been planted: But when the covenant is thus made, there is added, *And I will give unto thee, and to thy* *Sol.*

thy ſeed after thee the land wherein thou art a ſtranger, all the land of Canaan *for an everlaſting poſſeſſion.* As for that of the *Pſalmiſt*, where he thinks the holy Ghoſt ſpeaks otherwiſe; the force of this Argument muſt needs be this. That which is any where called a Covenant, that is not an appendant to a covenant; but the giving of the land of *Canaan* to the ſeed of *Abraham*, is there called by the name of a Covenant. He will not, I think, ſay, that Circumciſion is the Covenant between God and his people, he will not deny, but it is a ſigne and ſeale annext to the covenant; and yet, *Gen.* 17. 10. it is called a Covenant, *This is my Covenant which ſhe ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, every man-childe among you ſhall be circumciſed.* Metonimies of the adjunct are well enough known, and the common uſe of them in Scripture; but that it is his wiſdome for his advantage to conceale it.

New Teſtament Scriptures concluding *Abrahams* natural ſeed to be in Covenant.

My fifth and laſt argument is drawn from thoſe ſeveral Texts in the New Teſtament, which interpret this Covenant thus entred with *Abraham*, in that latitude; as extending to his natural iſſue, and not with limit to his ſpiritual ſeed; and that not barely in domeſtick or civil, but in ſpiritual promiſes; ſo that this one hath many in the bowels of it.

Rom 9 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Firſt, *Rom.* 9. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. *verſes.* The Apoſtle aggravating in the higheſt and ſaddeſt way, that great heavineſſe, aud continual ſorrow of heart, that he had for *Iſrael*; (not reſpective to civil or domeſtick, but higher concernments,) even for the whole body of *Iſrael*; his brethren and kinſmen according to the fleſh, as he expreſſeth himſelf, *v.* 3. For amplification of the real grounds of his trouble, that ſuch a people ſhould be caſt off; he reckons up their priviledges, the priviledges of all that according to the fleſh were Iſraelites; Priviledges formerly enjoyed, but now loſt, nine in number: *Who are Iſraelites, to whom appertaines the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the ſervice of God, and the Promiſes? Whoſe are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever,* Amen. Here ſure is enough to conclude them of the ſeed thus in covenant, to be of Gods adopted ſeed under the Promiſes.

Rom. 11. Throughout.

Secondly, *Rom.* 11. Throughout the whole body of the *chapter*, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the caſting off of Gods people. Thoſe

Those that are cast off from being a people of God, were once his people; those that are put out of covenant, were a people in Covenant; but the natural issue of *Abraham* (called *natural branches*, verse 21. being by right of birth of that Olive) are there broken off, cast off; therefore the natural issue was the seed in covenant.

Thirdly, *Mat.* 8. 11, 12. Upon occasion of the Faith of the *Centurion*, which Christ so magnifies, and preferres before the faith of any in *Israel*; he prophecies of the call of the Gentiles, and the rejection of the Jewes, *I say unto you, that many shall come from the East, and West, and shall sit down with* Abraham, *and* Isaac, *and* Jacob *in the Kingdome of heaven: But the children of the Kingdome shall be cast out into utter darknesse, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.* Nations from all quarters of the world, every point of the Heavens shall embrace the Faith, and be received visible members of the Kingdom of God; when the children of the Kingdome that are now in it, and enjoy it, shall be cast out of it; children of the Kingdome that are to be cast out, are in the Kingdome only upon an interest of birth, for the fruition of the priviledges of Ordinances, and not upon any spiritual title, infallibly giving interest in Salvation; But the children of the Kingdome were upon our Saviours sentence to be cast out, therefore they were in the Kingdome only on an interest of Birth. Mat. 8. 11, 12

Fourthly, *Gal* 2. 15. In that chapter among other things we have a narrative from the Apostle, of his dealing by way of reproof with *Peter* at *Antioch*. In which we may observe. Gal. 2. 15

(1.) The occasion given by *Peter*, vers. 12. *Before that certain came from* James, *he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself.*

(2.) The issue which followed upon this carriage of his, *And the other Jewes dissembled likewise with him, insomuch that* Barnabas *also was carried away with their dissimulation.*

(3.) Arguments brought for conviction of *Peter* of this error, which are two. The first in the 14. vers. *If thou being a Jew livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jewes, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jewes?* Thus the Argument runnes; It is unreasonable to draw others into a

practice that thou thy self purposely forbearest; But thou thy self keepest not the Jewish Rites and Ordinances, and therefore it is an unreasonable and blame-worthy practice, by thy example to compel others to their observation; yea, thou being a Jew, takest thy self to have freedome unreasonably, then dost thou draw on others, who were never under any such obligation. The second Argument is in the 15. and 16. *verses*, *We who are Jewes by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles; knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the Law; for by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified*, which is thus enforced. In that way wherein we who are Jews, with all our birth-priviledges cannot attain to righteousnes, we may not teach the Gentiles to attain to it. But we who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, cannot this way attaine to righteousnesse. We know that a man is justified by faith; we are compelled to quit the Law, and to cleave to Faith without works, for justification. These words which come up to our present purpose, containe. (1.) The priviledge of *Peter*, *Paul*, *Barnabas* with the rest of the Jewes. (2.) The character of the Gentiles in opposition to the Jewes. As to the full purpose for which these words are brought by the Apostle, they have for the sense of them their dependance on the words that follow; but so farre as they containe the priviledge of the Jewes, in opposition to, and above the Gentiles, (to which we are to speak) so farre they are full of themselves; shewing, First, Positively, what himself and *Peter* were, *Jewes by nature*. Secondly, Negatively, what they were not, *sinners of the Gentiles*. Where [nature] is taken, not in the proper, but vulgar acceptation, for birth or descent from Ancestours, as usually in our common phrase of speech we say, men are naturally *Dutch*, *French*, *Spanish*, *Irish*, when they are such borne and bred; This Scripture therefore *Camero* cites for one, in which the Apostle speaks after the vulgar manner. We have a Scripture parallel with this, *Rom.* 11. 24. wher [*nature*] and [*natural*] is only by birth and off spring, *Peter*, *Paul*, *Barnabas* were all naturally Jewes, borne of Jewish Parents, and bred up in the way and Religion of the Jewes; such onely Christ chose for Apostles, being himself a Minister of the Circumcision. *Peter* therefore being one of the twelve must ne-

cef-

ceſſarily be ſuch, *Paul* was ſuch as we know from his own month, *a Jew, and of the Tribe of* Benjamine. *Barnabas* was ſuch, *of the Tribe of* Levi. And being ſuch they enjoyed a priviledge which the Gentiles wanted; they were by birth and off-ſpring of a Nation that is holy. No Nation was ſo great as they, who had God ſo nigh unto them, who had ſtatutes and judgements ſo righteous. The Jew had every way prerogatives and advantages, but chiefly the Oracles of God. God had not dealt ſo with every Nation; when other Nations were without God, they had God nigh unto them; when others were uncleane, they were holy. This great priviledge of Birth, Gentiles wanted, and ſo were by off-ſpring ſinners; as Birth renders all, ſo they remaine unholy and uncleane, among the unholy and unclean without any ſuch title to the Covenant of God, that thereby they might obtaine any other denomination; they are dogs, while the people in Covenant are children. And by this means the ſeeming oppoſition which is between this text and that of the Apoſtle, *Epheſ.* 2. 3. is eaſily reconciled. Here the Apoſtle makes an oppoſition in nature between Jews and Gentiles; Jewes by nature had priviledge above Gentiles. There he makes Jewes and Gentiles in natnre equal? *We* (ſaith he) *were by nature children of wrath, as well as others*, as well as Heathens, that have no Birth-priviledge [*Nature*] in that Text is not the ſame as nature in this. [*Nature*] there is taken for the qualification of nature, which is equally defiled in Jewes and Gentiles, which is there evidenced in the converſation of the Jewes, being (before converſion by grace) the very ſame with the Gentiles. *Among whom alſo we all had our converſation in times paſt in the luſts of our fleſh, fulfilling the deſires of the fleſh and of the minde, and were by nature children of wrath, even as others.* [*Nature*] here is taken for a Birth-priviledge, and ſo the Jews (though in themſelves ſinners) are reputed an holy people, a people by covenant holy to the Lord. *Nature* ſimply conſidered, is ſtained, and renders Jewes and Gentiles equally ſinners and obnoxious to Gods wrath; of which, Juſtification by faith is an acknowledgement, as the Apoſtle here ſhews, *verſe* 17. But birth of Jewiſh Anceſtors, of the ſtock of *Iſrael* puts them into a ſelect condition, into the number of a people holy to the Lord. Neither is this any contradiction; common things dedicated for holy ſervice and uſe, are holy: A

people by nature ſinners dedicated to the Lord, are for holy ſervice and uſe, for the ſervice of the Lord, when others are for ſervice of idols. Therefore *Jeruſalem* a City, none of the holieſt for any tranſcendent manners of the inhabitants thereof, is yet called by the Evangeliſt, *the holy City*, by reaſon of the Temple and worſhip there, that were holy.

That which is a priviledge of nature or birth, belongs to the natural iſſue, that cannot be denied: But to be in covenant with God as a people holy and exceeding others that are without as ſinners, is a priviledge of nature or birth; therefore this priviledge belongs to the natural iſſue. This Argument, as it is cleare of it ſelfe, ſo it hath this advantage, that for interpretation of the word [*Nature*] it hath approbation from profeſt adverſaries; one ſaith, *I grant his ſenſe of the word* Nature, *and that the Apoſtle there ſpeaks of himſelf and other Jewes, as in reputation more holy then the Gentiles, becauſe of their intereſt in Circumciſion, and obſervance of* Moſes *Law*; And this grant involves him not in a few contradictions. 1. That this was a Birth-priviledge as he here acknowledges, being the Jews priviledge by birth of nature, and therefore belonged to the natural ſeed; when elſewhere he ſaith, they inherit onely domeſtick and civil benefits. 2. This intereſt in Circumciſion, and obſervance of *Moſes* Law, was a priviledge of Ordinances, and he is wont to deny, that birth entitles any to ſuch priviledges. 3. This is a ſpiritual mercy which the Jews here had in Circumciſion, and *Moſes* Law. Circumciſion by his confeſſion ſeales Goſpel-mercies, the ſame that Baptiſm ſealeth, And *Moſes* in the Law wrote of Chriſt, *John* 1.45 *John* 5.46. and yet he denies the natural ſeed any Promiſe of ſpiritual mercies. Any one of theſe arguments ſeverally, much more all joyntly make good this Poſition, that all the natural ſeed of *Abraham* by *Iſaac* and *Jacob* are in that great Charter (vouchſafed of God) taken into covenant, ſo as to be the people of God, and to enjoy all priviledges of his people, in order (upon Gods termes) to everlaſting ſalvation.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVII.

ROM. 9. 6, 7, 8. *Vindicated.*

THough I hear of none that have much to say to all these Scriptures, as indeed little, rather nothing can be said; they hold forth with so clear a light a covenant in that latitude, and with those prerogatives, as you have heard; yet one hath a Text of Scripture, not to clear any one, but to silence and overthrow them all, and that is the words of the Apostle, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. where the Apostle (having sufficiently hinted to them the rejection of a great part of the Jews, in his profession of that great heavinesse and sorrow of heart in their behalf, and that he could wish that himself were accursed from Christ for them) undertakes to answer an objection. *If* Israel *be cast off then the Word of God will be of none effect, his promise will faile; But the promise of God made with his people cannot faile, therefore* Israel *in such a considerable number is not cast off. In which place* (saith One) *this very Text, that now is the apple of our contention, was brought into question.* This Argument thus held out in behalf of the Anabaptists is borrowed from *Stapleton* the Jesuite, at least *Stapleton* hath gone before him in it, and he hath learned to a haire to follow him. [a] *Stapleton* in his antidote, undertaking to make good that *Calvin* contradicts the Apost. (which he puts into his Marg.) saith, Calvin *says, that the whole progeny of* Abraham *is holy, because God entred the covenant of life with him in these words; I will be a God to thee and thy seed, that is according to* Calvin, *to all that shall descend from him, to all that according to the flesh are borne to him, as also now* (*the partition-wall being taken away*) *to all the children of Christians, which acording to the flesh shal be born to them; And* Calvin *addeth* (saith he) *that God calls all of the off-spring of* Israel *his children; But* (saith he) *the Apostle speaks the contrary expressely. They are not all* Israel *that are of*

a *Dicit* Calvinus *totam Abrahæ progeniem esse sanctam, quia fœdus vitæ Deus cum illo pepigerat his* viz. *verbis: Ero Deus tibi & semini tuo, id est, ut* Calvinus *vult omnibus ab* Abrahamo *oriundis, omnibus ex secundùm carnem natis, sicut nunc, dirutâ maceriâ omnibus Christianorum parentum liberis ab illis secundùm carnem natis. Addit, Deum omnes filios suos vocare, qui ex* Israele *sunt progeniti. Atqui Apostolus dissertissimè contrarium dicit, non omnes qui ex* Israele, *ii sunt* Israelitæ; *neque qui semen sunt* Abrahæ *omnes filii, sed in Isaac vocabitur tibi semen, id est, non qui filii carnis, hi sunt filii Dei sed qui filii sunt promissionis, æstimantur in semine. Filii autem promissionis sunt filii secundùm Spiritum sive ex* Abraham & Isaac *carnaliter oriundi, sive non.*

Israel

Iſrael, *neither becauſe they are the ſeed of* Abraham *are they all children, but in* Iſaac *ſhal thy ſeed be caled; that is, they that are the children of the fleſh, thoſe are not the children of God, but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed. But* (ſaith he) *the children of the promiſe are children born after the Spirit, whether they deſcended from* Abraham *and* Iſaac, *or no*, with much more to this purpoſe. We have drunk up the Proteſtants poiſon, and their great care is, to preſerve their party by the Jeſuites antidote; They are wholly beholding to them for the receipt; what *probatum eſt* they can write upon it, muſt be examined. And that they may not deny, but in the examination of this triumphing Argument, they have ſquare dealing, I ſhall give you the Authours words at length. *I deny not* (ſaith he) *but there was ſome other promiſe included in that objection, to wit, ſome promiſe made to* Iſrael, *or the houſe of* Iſrael, *probably that*, Jerem 31. 33, 36, 37. *For ſo the words*, verſe 6. *They are not all* Iſrael *which are of* Iſrael, *do intimate. But without queſtion the promiſe made to* Abraham, *Gen.* 17.7. *was one which was included in that objection*; Beza, Twiſſe, Ames, *and others anſwering* Arminius, *call it the Covenant of God with* Abraham, *which was that*, Gen. 17.7. *and the very phraſe of* Abrahams *ſeed* (*in* Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called*, verſe 7. *The children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed*, verſe 8. Sarah *ſhall have a ſonne, as* verſe 9.) *do evidently ſhew, that the promiſe* (*objected to prove, that if the Jews were rejected from being Gods people, then God failed in making good his word*) *was that promiſe to* Abraham; *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed; whereto I may adde that the anſwerers of* Arminius, *and the cited Remonſtrants, to wit*, Baine, *and* Ames, *do ſay it was the word of promiſe, not of the Law, as* Arminius *conceived; for the word of promiſe, ſaith* Ames, Animadv in Remonſtran. Script. Synod. de prædeſt. Cap. 8. Sect. 4. *is diſtinguiſhed and oppoſed to the words of the Law*, Gal. 3. 17, 18. *Now the word of the promiſe there is to* Abraham *and his ſeed*, verſe 16. *and this is there called by him* verbum fœderis, *the word of the Covenant; now let us conſider how the Apoſtle anſwers it. He denies that Gods Word made to* Abraham *did fall, though the Jews were rejected; becauſe that promiſe, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed; as it comprehended ſaving grace, was never meant by God of all* Abrahams *poſterity, or of any barely as they were deſcended from* Abraham *by natural generation; but of the Elect, whether deſcended by natural gene-*

ration

ration from Abraham *or not. And this is apparent, both from the words,* verſ. 7. *Neither becauſe they are the ſeed of* Abraham, *are they all children, but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called,* verſ. 8. *It is exponnded thus; that is, they which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God, but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed. Whence it is apparent, that the ſame are not always the ſeed by calling, which are the ſeed of* Abraham *by natural generation; and that the children of the fleſh are not the ſame with the children of the promiſe, and that the Apoſtle conceived this the right way of anſwering thoſe that objected the falling of Gods word, upon the rejection of the Jews, by reſtraining the promiſe of being God to* Abrahams *ſeed, only to the Elect, whether of* Abrahams *natural poſterity or not; with ſo little reſpect to any birth-right-priviledge, that he not onely rejected* Iſhmael, *and took* Iſaac, *but alſo loved* Jacob, *and hated* Eſau; *by prophecie declaring his minde, The elder ſhall ſerve the younger, and in this, the Apoſtle acquits God from unrighteouſneſſe, in that he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens; notwithſtanding his promiſe made to* Abraham *and* Iſrael, *or any Birth-priviledge they could claime.* Yeelding that this Text in that place is brought into queſtion by the Apoſtle: Before I come to the Apoſtles words themſelves, I have divers Queres to put.

1. How *Baine* and *Ames* come to the name of *Remonſtrants?* I had thought they had been on the party that are called *Contra-Remonſtrants?*

2. Where it appears that *Arminius* conceived that the covenant there ſpoken to, was the word of the Law, and not of Promiſe; I am ſure in his Analyſis on this Chapter to the *Romans* he ſpeaks in another manner, even in our authours own *Dialect*, as though the ones Comment had been ſpit out of the mouth of the other. (b) *The ſons of the fleſh, with the Apoſtle,* (ſaith he) *are thoſe that by the works of the Law, follow after righteouſneſſe and ſalvation. The ſonnes of the promiſe are thoſe that ſeek after righteouſneſſe and ſalvation by faith in Chriſt,* and he thus frames the principal Syllogiſm of the Apoſtle, for confutation of the Jews arguing from the rejection of the Jews, Gods failing in his promiſe. (c) *If the word of God comprehend only the ſonnes of the promiſe, ſhut-*

b *Filii carnis Apoſtolo hoc loco ſunt, qui per opera legis juſtitiam & ſalutem conſectantur.*

Filii verò promiſſionis ſunt illi qui fide in Chriſtum juſtitiam & ſalutem quarunt

c *Si verbum Dei ſolos filios comprehendit, excluſis filiis carnis, tum-*

ſequitur verbum Dei non excidere, etiamſi filii carnis rejiciantur, imò excidere ſi admitterentur iſti qui deſcriptione ipſa conditionis fœderis excluduntur. At verbum Dei ſolos filios promiſſionis comprehendit, excluſis filiis carnis. Ergo verbum Dei non excidit, etiamſi filii carnis rejiciantur. sing

ting out the sons of the flesh; then it follows that the word of God doth not faile though the sons of the flesh be rejected: But the word of God comprehends only the sons of promise, shutting out the sonnes of the flesh; Therefore the word of God doth not faile, though the sons of the flesh be rejected. Armin. Anal. Cap. 9. ad Ro. p. 781. Let any now judge whether he can interpret this of the Law and not of the promise.

3. When he affirmes that to be borne after the flesh is all one with the Apostle, with legal justiciaries, as he doth (which is *Arminius* his Interpretation) how then can he by that distinction of children of the flesh, and children of the promise, shut out the natural seed of *Abraham*? are the natural seed of *Abraham*, and legal justiciaries one and the same?

4. If the Apostle exclude all the natural seed of *Abraham* from this Covenant of God (as *Stapleton* argues, and from him the Anabaptists) and takes in only his spiritual seed, how can he be reconciled to himself? in the words immediately before this objection, he speaks of the Jewes (as his kinsmen according to the flesh, which were the natural seed of *Abraham*) and saith, *To them pertaine the Adoption, the Glory, and the Covenants, &c.* How then can his distinction be interpreted to throw them out of Covenant, when in expresse termes he had affirmed that they were in covenant? How can he deny that these are children, *vers.* 7. when he had affirmed that to them pertaineth the Adoption, *vers.* 4. Which may be confirmed by abundant other Texts of Scripture; *Ye are the children of the Lord your God*, Deut. 14. 1. *Out of* Egypt *have I called my Sonne*, Hosea. 11. 1. *It is not meet to take the childrens bread, and cast it unto Dogges*, Matth. 15. 26. where all that were not Gentiles, all to whom Christ was sent, are called children; *Ye are the children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with your Fathers*, Act. 3. 20. Doth the Covenant appertaine to them, and they stiled the children of the Covenant, and yet are they out of Covenant? Are they children to whom the Adoption pertaines, and yet no children? When they have given any faire answer to these Quere's, especially the two last: we shall conceive some probability of truth in their Glosse on the Apostles words; in the meane time we cannot but look upon it in full opposition and contradiction to that which the Apostle expressely delivers. For the Text of

the

the Apostle, it will be besides my purpose to make any full Comment upon it; it will be sufficient to take it out of their hands, and vindicate it from that which they would assert from it, and to let the Reader know the Apostles scope in that place, which is not to make a full Comment on those words, *Gen.* 17.7. but only to free it from an objection which the unbeleeving Jews might raise from it. God hath made a Covenant with them, *to be their God, and the God of their seed.* If he now cast them off as the Apostle doth affirme, the Covenant then is broke, *and the word of God is of none effect.* The Apostle denies that this follows, and shews that the terme [*Israel,*] or [*children of* Abraham,] admits of distinction, and produces a Scripture, *vers.*7. where one distinction is implied, *viz. Gen.*21.12. *In* Isaac *shall thy seed be called*, and so a numerous company by *Ishmael* is excluded (who were *Abrahams* seed after the flesh) and only the sons of promise by *Isaac* are accounted the seed, *vers.*8. that come from *Isaac*, borne by miracle. And *verse* 10, 11, 12, 13. seconds it with others concerning the children of *Isaac*, *Esau* and *Jacob*. As then there was a distinction of seed; so also now, one member he had laid down before, *viz. Israelites according to the flesh* vested in all those priviledges there reckoned up, *ver.* 4, 5. These they pleaded, and the Apostle yeelds them; And these men (according to the discovery of these times) deny them. The second member he after falls upon, *the eternally beloved and chosen of God*, and largely amplifies. In these *Abrahams* seed may continue, though the other be cast off; to whom yet God hath continued (in successive generations) a God in covenant, and continued to them the priviledges of being his people, though now he was upon the rejection of them: And that it may appear that I go not alone, I shall give an Exposition of this Text from a more able Penne, above the suspition of an *Arminian*, which is here charged, namely *Gomarus*, who (having in his Analysis on that Chapter, spoken to the Jews objection, and the Apostles answer) makes this inference; (a) *From whence* (saith he) *the Apostles conclusion* (*in which he denies that Gods word concerning the Cove-*

a *Unde perspicua est Apostoli sententia quâ negatur excidere seu irritum reddi Sermonem de fœdere cum* Abrahamo *& semine illius, deque benedictione & salute per promissum* Messiam, Gal 3.17 *quamvis* Judæorum *maxima pars à* Christo *& benedictione exclusa sit Anathema. Idque probat distinctione Israelitarum & seminis* Abrahami; *eâque ratione ostendit promissionem* Dei *ratione efficaciæ illius esse indefinitam ac sensu particularem, non autem*

nant

universalem, ac præterea universalem perperam indè constitui nam quamvis Israelitæ plerique pereant promissionem tamen Dei minimè reddi irritam indè constat, quia in electis est efficax. Non enim omnes, ut v. 6. ait, qui sunt ex Israele patre prognati secundùm carnem, sunt veri illi Israelitæ; ad quos fœderis gratiæ Dei non solum oblatio cum conditione officii præstandi, sed etiam collatio & hæreditas cœlestis reipsâ pertineat, ut ver. 7. exponitur clarius, & Rom. 2. 28. & 29. Neque quia semen Abrahami sunt, ideo omnes sunt filii seu hæredes benedictionis illius & ejusdem gratiæ gloriæque participes, Rom. 4. 12. Gal. 4. 28. Quamvis enim hæc videantur & inter se & cum superioribus pugnare quibus docuit Apostolos Judæos incredulos esse Israelitas & Abrahamitas, non solum origine carnis, sed etiam ratione fœderum & promissionum acceptarum; nulla est dissentio. Etsi enim ad omnes Israelitas & patres & Adoptio & fœdera ac promissiones pertineant, non propterea tamen sunt omnes verè filii & hæredes salutis. Illa enim quæ objectantur Judæis infidelibus ab Apostolo tribuuntur, quidem ratione vocationis externæ (quia salus iis sub conditione obedientiæ annunciata & oblata est & oblatio illius Circumcisione obsignata; unde omnes Israelitæ filii fœderis dicuntur communiter, Act. 3. 25.) Sed non ratione vocationis, internæ & efficacis secundùm propositum electionis, qua salus non solùm exterius cum conditione fidei vivæ annunciata & oblata est verbo ac signata Sacramentis, sed etiam interiùs efficaciter donata conditione seu fide confertur a Spiritu sancto. Hoc enim solùm genuinis filiis & verè electis Israelitis convenit non autem promiscuè omnibus.

nant with Abraham *and his seed, and the blessing and salvation by the promised* Messiah, Gal. 3. 17. *did fall, or become void) is manifest, though the greatest part of the Jews be shut out from Christ, and accursed. And this he proves by distinguishing Israelites and the seed of* Abraham; *and thereby shews that the promise of God, respective to the efficacy of it, is indefinite, and therefore particular, not universal, and so an universal promise cannot rightly from thence be concluded: for though the Israelites for a great part perish, yet that the promise of God is not thereby made void appeares, in that it hath its efficacy in the Elect; for as he saith,* verse 6. *All which are of* Israel (*borne according to the flesh*) *are not true Israelites, to whom not only the tender of the Covenant of Grace, with condition of duty to be performed; but the heavenly possession and inheritance only belongs, as in* ver. 7. *and* Rom. 2. 28, 29. *is more fully shewn; Neither because they are the seed of* Abraham, *are they therefore all children, or heirs of that blessing, and partakers of the same grace and glory, as* Rom. 4. 12. Gal. 4. 28. *For though these things seem contradictory to themselves, and to that also which was delivered before, where the Apostle affirmes that the unbeleeving Jews are* Abrahamites, *and Israelites; not only by reason of their birth after the flesh, but also by reason of acceptance of the Covenants, and promises, yet there is no contradiction; For though the Fathers, and Adoption, and Covenants, and Promises belong to all the Israelites, yet all*

are

are not therefore true children, and heirs of salvation. For those things which are objected, viz. *The Jewes great priviledges, are attributed by the Apostle to the unbeleeving Jewes, by vertue of their outward call, because salvation is revealed and offered to them under condition of obedience, and that offer sealed with Circumcision, from whence all Israelites are promiscuously called children of the covenant,* as Acts 3.25.) *and not by reason of their inward call according to the purpose of Election effectual, because salvation is not only outwardly under condition of a lively faith revealed and offered in the word, and sealed in the Sacrament; but also inwardly and efficaciously, (the condition, that is, faith being given them) is conferred by the Holy Ghost. For this belongs not indifferently to all, but only to the genuine Sonnes and true elect Israelites.* Thus farre *Gomarus*, in which we have these three things. 1. This objection wholly solved. 2. The Apostle reconciled to himself. And, 3. The Doctrine of Covenant-holinesse from the Apostle fully established, which when they have well considered, with that which was spoke before; (having the whole current of Scripture against them) they will have little list to make this one Scripture their *asylum.*

Object. It is farther said, that when the Pharisees and Sadducees came to *Johns* Baptisme, and were about to plead this Birth-priviledge, *John* beats them off it, and takes that plea out of their mouths: *Think not to say within your selves, we have* Abraham *to our father,* Matth. 3. 9. that plea could not stand when the men were carnal.

Sol. I answer, First, when those that were no better than these, make the same plea, *John* 8. 33. *We be* Abrahams *seed, and were never in bondage to any*; Christ yeelds it, *vers.* 37. *I know that ye are* Abrahams *seed*; he allows them all that upon this account they can claime. And for Pharisees he doth not barely yeeld them to be Church-Members, but also Church-Teachers, *Matth* 23 2. 2. I say *John Baptist* doth not deny what Christ yeelds, but lets them know, that this plea, will not serve to avoid wrath, while they live in impenitence; They may perish notwithstanding this plea, and yet Gods Covenant with *Abraham* hold; being able of stones to raise up children unto *Abraham*, to make good what in Covenant he had said. He no where sayes that they are not entitled to priviledges of Ordinances, and thereby

intereſſed in the prerogatives of Gods viſible people. What *Paul*, Rom. 9. 4, 5. ſo largely yeelds them, *John Baptiſt* in that place doth not deny them, which alſo now they had in viſible poſſeſſion. All ſorts of men, fare better by priviledge of birth in civil things, *Prov.* 19. 14. *Houſe and riches are the inheritance of fathers.* The Jews fared better reſpective to Religious things, *Rom.* 3. 1. *What advantage then hath the Jew, or what profit is there of Circumciſion? Much every way.* Priviledge of Ordinances in the Church of God, is a Birth-inheritance.

CHAP. XLVIII.

The Covenant in New Teſtament-times takes in parents with their children.

BUt in caſe all this be yeelded in Old Teſtament-times, that the Covenant entred was in this latitude, that the whole of *Abrahams* ſeed were taken with him into Covenant, and that then it ran in a race by carnal deſcent, yet it is otherwiſe at leaſt in New Teſtament-times. No childe fares now the better reſpective to any viſible Church-intereſt, for the Faith or Religion of their Anceſtours. And here is a fourth difference between the firſt and ſecond, the Old and New Covenant according to ſome. The firſt Covenant was entred in that latitude, to take in Children with their parents, Poſterity with their Anceſtours, according to the Charter ſo long inſiſted upon: But in New Teſtament-times, the Covenant reaches no farther then the perſon that actually enters; He covenants for himſelf, his ſeed have no more or farther intereſt then the ſeed of Heathens and Pagans. When I firſt publiſhed my *Birth-priviledge*, I here expected oppoſition, and did look that ſome would appeare to put this limit to the Covenant in New Teſtament-times, but for the ſtate of the Church under the firſt covenant I thought I ſhould not have found an oppoſite, and therefore was leſſe mindful of the confirmation of it, which I hope is now done to the Readers full ſatisfaction. As to thoſe that plead ſuch a change of things in New Teſtament-times, we might interrogate them in ſundry particulars. First,

First, when God by free Charter, did once vouchsafe such a grant to his people, how it can be made appear that it was ever reversed; or any such limit put to it, when the Church of God hath held it in fee from *Abraham* to this present hour, they may well look that they should produce some plaine word from God (revoking his grant) that challenge them for usurpation. It is true that Gods Sovereignty is such, that he may contract his grace at pleasure; As he may wholly strike a people out of covenant, so he may put what termes he pleases to it; but such that affirme it should make it appear, in which hitherto they have been silent. They that will eject us out of so long a possession, had need to make their plea firm for our eviction. Quere's premised.

Secondly, we might demand the reasons why the Covenant should run in so narrow a limit now, being vouchsafed in so great a latitude then being once made of God as with men of yeares, so with little ones, *Deut.* 29. Why should little ones be now excluded, and onely men of growth admitted? when it is granted on all hands that God continues a people to himself, how comes it to passe that he admits them on such new termes? That his favours are now thus shortened, that as a lease for terme of life, differs from a fee-simple for inheritance, so the Covenant in New Testament-times differs from the Covenant vouchsafed of God to our fathers? Where the absurdity lies that Baptisme should be administred to those that do not actually beleeve, when yet Circumcision was administred to infants in as great an incapacity.

Thirdly, we might demand how they can avoid that great scandall that must needs by this meanes be given to the beleeving Jewes, (who waved the old way of the administration of the covenant, and embraced the new) to have their infants upon this new admission struck out of Covenant, A man that should be seized on an inheritance for ever, will hardly be brought to quit that tenure and accept with limit for terme of life, *God was their God, and the God of their seed*, Gen. 17.7. *They did bring forth children to God*, Ezek. 16. 20. Now they bring forth children without God. They have a seed, but no holy seed; a world repleniſhed, but not a Church or people to God continued; The savage Indians in a married condition have this priviledge that their issue are not bastards, and this is all that can be claimed by Christians.

Fourthly, we might demand if ſo great a change were made and held in the Apoſtolique Primitive times, how it comes to paſſe that there was ſuch ſilence, no man moving a queſtion about it? The pomp of worſhip and obſervation of places formerly in uſe, was laid aſide in Goſpel-times, but this we hear of, and the reaſon of it, *John* 4.22. The initiating Sacrament of Circumciſion had a period put to it, of this we hear, and many complaints about it? Pſalteries, Harps, Organs, Cymbals, and ſuch inſtruments of muſick, in uſe in the time of the Law, were laid aſide in Goſpel-times, and not known in the weſterne Churches till after *Thomas Aquinas* his dayes; As this was done, ſo it was not paſt in ſilence, but ſpoken of, (as elſewhere I have ſhewn, and given reaſons of it) by *Juſtin Martyr*, [or at leaſt one that beares his name,] *Chryſoſtome*, *Iſidore*, *Thomas Aquinas*. When none of theſe changes can paſſe, but obſervation is made, it is more then ſtrange that ſo great a change as this in the termes of the Covenant, between God and his people, can be ſo carried on without any obſervation at all, or one word once moved about it, or ſpoken in it? See Maſter *Baxters* Treatiſe of *Infants Church-membership*, proving that Infants were ſometimes Church-members, *page* 26,27. that there is no repeale of this grant vouchſafed of God, *p.* 27,28. Waiting for ſome faire anſwer to the former demands, I ſhall proceed to thoſe texts of Scripture, where the Covenant in New Teſtament-times is held out in this latitude to beleevers and their ſeed, comprizing their parents in the ſame priviledge of Covenant and participation of promiſe.

Acts 2.38, 39 vindicated.

Firſt, let us look into thoſe words of *Peter*, delivered in his firſt Sermon after the receiving of the holy Ghoſt, (the firſt place in which the Covenant of promiſe, and Baptiſme the Seale of the Covenant are mentioned) to the Jewes, with whom the Apoſtles as yet held communion being not actually rejected out of a viſible Church-ſtate; *Repent, and be baptiſed every one of you in the Name of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſinnes, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt. For the promiſe is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afarre off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call*, Acts 2.38,39. In which words we may obſerve. 1. An Exhortation, as, to repentance for the guilt of the blood of Chriſt; (of which they ſtood convinced) ſo, alſo unto Baptiſme. 2. A Motive ſtirring them up to embrace

The text analized.

embrace baptisme in the name of Christ, drawn from the benefit which they shall reap, *Ye shall receive the gift of the holy Ghost.* 3. A farther encouragement to the acceptation of Baptism drawn from their Covenant-priviledge, which is here set out in its full latitude and extent (as *Calvin* rightly upon the words observeth) 1. To the Jewes, *For the promise is unto you.* 2. To their children, *and to your children.* 3. To the Gentiles upon call, *and to you that are afarre off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call*, Where an effectual call cannot be meant (which the Apostle calls a *call according to purpose*) proper only to the elect, It is a call unto such a Church-state, as the whole Nation of the Jews did then enjoy, as the first-borne in the family; A call that puts them into a like Church-state, and condition with the Jews. From whence this argument may be drawn. Those to whom the Covenant of promise appertaines have a right to Baptisme; But the covenant of promise appertaines to men in a Church-state and condition, and to their children. The major cannot be denied by any that will not make themselves the Apostles opposites. The minor proposition is now to be considered, That the covenant of promise to men in a Church-state and condition is in that latitude as to comprize their children. For which the words of the Apostle are full and clear, *To you is the promise made, and to your children,* on which *Calvin* rightly comments. *Peter observes* (saith he) *a due order, when he assigns the first place of honour to the Jewes, That it takes in children, it depends on the words of the promise,* Gen. 17.7. *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.* Where God joynes children with their parents in the priviledge of adoption, in the inheritance of priviledges belonging to all Church-members.

But this clear text wants not wits that study to cloud it; Some except against the word [*children*,] and will have them to be the same as the *sons and daughters* mentioned, *v.* 17. of that chapter, from *Joel*, *chap.* 2.28 and consequently the promise to be meant of the Spirit of prophecie, and to appertaine to none but those of age and capacity for prophecie. To this I answer, 1. The extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghost in this visible way cannot be the promise here by Saint *Peter* mentioned, seeing it is enlarged *to all that are afarre off, even to as many as the Lord shall call.* But all these have not the holy Ghost in that way extraordinary, nor any promise of it; Baptisme with the holy Ghost and with fire, is a baptism

Objections answered.

baptiſme proper to thoſe primitive Saints, wherewith they were told that they ſhould be baptized not many dayes after. 2 How-ſoever the promiſe be interpreted ſo, as to belong to all that are beleevers, and call on the name of the Lord, as there followes, yet that promiſe is on condition of their baptiſme; The meanes are to be uſed in reference to the end, Baptiſme is the meanes, receiving of the holy Ghoſt (there ſpecified) is the end; And the Apoſtle confirming them in the promiſe of the end, doth likewiſe encourage them to the uſe of the meanes, in Baptiſme to expect the gift of the Spirit, and ſo (according to this interpretation) that place is an encouragement to baptiſme. The promiſe is the fitteſt encouragement to the Signe and Seale of the promiſe. Baptiſme is the Signe and Seale to which they are here encouraged, and in that latitude as they had formerly known the command of Circumciſion. 3. Neither are the children here mentioned the ſame with ſonnes and daughters ſpoken of by the Prophet, nor limitted to ſuch ſonnes and daughters as are of growth, and capable of the gift of propheſie. 1. The Apoſtle urgeth the promiſe in the way, as in the Scripture it is delivered, which is to men and their poſterity, to them and theirs. So God promiſes to be a God in covenant to his and their ſeed, and this the Apoſtle holds out, to draw them on to the Seale of the covenant to accept Baptiſme on the ſame terms that *Abraham* did circumciſion. 2. It is without reaſon to beleeve that the Apoſtle ſhould inſtance in one peece of the diſtribution of the Prophet there, and to leave out the reſt; to put in alone ſons and daughters, when we have in the Text young men, old men, ſervants and handmaids. 3. Children here are mentioned under a promiſe to the parents, *to you and your children is the promiſe made*, but not ſo in *Joel*, nor in the quotation of the Apoſtle. That Scripture hath only an enumeration of the ſeveral ſorts and conditions of people in any Nation, on all which the ſpirit is promiſed, without any reference made to the parents of thoſe ſonnes and daughters, more then to the maſters of thoſe ſervants and handmaids; not the ſonnes and daughters of their fleſh, but the ſonnes and daughters of the Nation. A Lauguage uſual in our ordinary expreſſions ſpeaking of men of any ſort or condition, as your Lawyers, your Merchants, &c. ſo here, your ſonnes, your daughters, your old men, your young men, &c Others ſay, *That the promiſe made, is the ſending of Jeſus Chriſt, and*

bleſſing

bleſſing by him as is expounded, Acts 3.25, 26. Act. 13.32. Ro. 15.39. I anſwer; it is true, that Jeſus Chriſt is the moſt eminent mercy promiſed, and may be called the promiſe *virtualiter*, being the ground of all promiſes, and therefore ſome interpreters have mentioned the gift of Chriſt on this occaſion. But it is plaine that Gods Covenant, and this gift are to be diſtinguiſhed; Chriſt is promiſed in priority to the Jew, before the Gentile; The Jew then is taken into Covenant before this gift of Chriſt can be of them expected: It is therefore the Covenant it ſelf (entered with parent and child, root and branch) that is here meant (as *Calvin* in the words before obſerves) from which the giving of Chriſt in the fleſh follows. And therefore *Diodati* fully pitches upon the true ſenſe of it, *Seeing as you are* Abrahams *children, you are within the Covenant, you ought to acknowledge Chriſt to be the head and fountaine of the Covenant The Covenant, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed, is here meant, which from* Abraham *had been the Jewes priviledge*, Rom. 9.

It is farther ſaid, that *the limitation, as many as the Lord our God ſhall call, ſhewes that the promiſe belongs to them, not ſimply as Jewes, but as called of God; which is more expreſſely affirmed*, Acts 3.26. *To you firſt God having raiſed up his Sonne Jeſus, ſent him to bleſſe you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* I wonder how it came into any mans head to call this amplification, a limitation, it plainly enough ſpeaks their boldneſſe in dealing with the Scriptures; Had the Apoſtle ſaid, To you is the promiſe made, and to your ſeed, in caſe God ſhall give you a call, he had ſpoke to their purpoſe; but ſaying, *To you, and to as many as the Lord your God ſhall call*; it plainly ſhewes that he does not limit, but amplifie the mercy, extending it not barely to the Jewes (who in preſent by reaſon of fruition of Ordinances were a people near to the Lord, *Pſal.* 148.14.) but alſo to the Gentiles, who *Epheſ.* 2.17. were afarre off. 2. In that he ſaith, this promiſe belongs to them not ſimply as Jewes, but as called, is a full contradiction: A Jew uncalled (at this time before the Kingdome was taken from them) is as much as a Convert unconverted, or a Gentile diſciple undiſcipled: In caſe they think to come off by limitting it to an effectual call, the Scriptures by themſelves quoted, doth evidently contradict it, Chriſt came to give them, that effectual calling, and not onely to thoſe that were thus called. It is yet ſaid, *Peter doth exhort to repentance, and*

Baptiſme together, and in the firſt place perſwades to repentance, then to Baptiſme, which ſhews repentance to be in order before baptiſme. To which I anſwer, that theſe who had crucified Chriſt as a blaſphemer, a ſeditious perſon, an impoſtour muſt needs repent before they would accept Baptiſme in his name, or hope for remiſſion of ſinne by him; It had been loſt labour for the Apoſtle, to have preſſed thoſe, that had crucified Chriſt, and retained their former opinion of him, to become diſciples to him, and to look to be ſaved by him, To perſwade them to look for remiſſion of ſinnes in his blood, who took themſelves to be without ſinne in ſhedding of it; Yet notwithſtanding this guilt (of which the Apoſtle would have them to repent) he ſhews that they and their ſeed are under the promiſe of God, and puts them into a way, in acceptation of Chriſt in the Goſpel-tender, in his preſent way of adminiſtration, to be continued his people ſtill in covenant, and that (as is plainly enough ſignified) that they might enjoy it in their former latitude, to them and to their children. The promiſe (of which they were not yet diſpoſſeſt, but ſtood as a people of God in viſible Covenant, and their children) is here brought as a motive to encourage them to hold correſpondency with God (as his covenant-people) embracing the way which their long expected, and deſired Meſſiah had now inſtituted & appointed. But this promiſe was to them and their children. Here is yet another evaſion, *The text ſpeaks not expreſſely of Infants, but of children indefinitely*; And if infants be not children, we will be content that they be caſt out of covenant, and will hold no more plea for their Church-membership nor Baptiſme. God in the Covenant with *Abraham* did not expreſſely mention infants, but ſeed, yet infants were his ſeed, and, as his ſeed, by Gods command to be circumciſed, And all our infants are our children, and conſequently to be baptized, *Acts* 20. 7. is an expreſſe Text with ſome of this party (without any help of conſequence) to prove that women received the Lords Supper, *Becauſe it is ſaid that diſciples came together to break bread*, as though woman, and diſciple, were *ſynonyma*? But here the promiſe being made to children, infants muſt neither be comprized in the letter, nor yet by any favour of conſequence included.

It is further objected, that the text ſpeaks not of the children of the Gentiles at all (of whom we are) but of the children

of

of the Jews, and therefore if that promise be extended to infants, which doth not appear, the promise is to be expounded so, as to note something peculiar to the Jews infants. If the Gospel held out any such transcending priviledges appertaining to the seed of the Jews above the Gentiles, they may do well to produce a Text for it, otherwise we shall take it for granted from Saint *Paul*, that there is none at all, that in Christ there is *neither Greek nor Jew, Circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free.* And when the Apostle addes, *To those that are afarre off, even as many as the Lord shall call*, he plainly meanes the Gentiles, as appears, comparing *Ephes.* 2. 13. and though I take not the boldnesse to adde to the words, as some stand charged, yet it is cleare, that the same is understood there in reference to the children of the Gentiles, that is exprest before to the children of the Jewes. If any shall grant an inheritance to *Titius* and his heires for ever, and to *Caius*, every one will understand that the heires of *Caius* are meant as well as the heirs of *Titius*, especially if it can be proved out of the Grant it self, that the priviledges conveyed to *Caius*, are as ample, as that to *Titius*. We can prove the priviledges granted to the Gentiles in the Gospel to be equal to those granted to the Jews, when the Jews children then are under the promise with their parents, the children of beleeving Gentiles cannot be excluded.

CHAP. XLIX.

Rom. 11. 16. Vindicated.

SECT. I.

The Series *of the Apostles dispute opened, and several Arguments deduced.*

THe next Scripture for proof of the Covenant in New Testament-times takes in children with the parents, is *Rom.* 11. 16. *For if the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy, and if the*

The Series of the Apostles dispute.

root be holy, ſo are the branches; which Scripture, that it may be aright underſtood, we muſt look into the whole *Series* of the Apoſtles diſpute in that place, Having before largely diſcourſed of the rejection of the Jewes, out of a preſent Church-ſtate and fellowſhip with the call of the Gentiles, and their preſent Adoption, now ſomewhat to allay the ſeeming harſhneſſe of that doctrine of his againſt the Jewes, and to take down the inſultings of the Gentiles over that people, in this chapter he ſpeaks to both. 1. To the Jews by way of mitigation, limiting this doctrine of their rejection with a double caution. 1. That it was not total. 2. That it was not final. That it was not total, he firſt aſſerts, ſecondly proves; aſſerts, *ver.* 1. *I ſay then, hath God caſt away his people? God forbid.* Proves by a threefold argument. 1. By inſtance in himſelf, *verſe* 1. *For I am alſo an Iſraelite, of the ſeed of* Abraham, *of the Tribe of* Benjamin, and he doth not diſpute for his own rejection. 2. By inſtance in the elect of God, *verſe* 2. *God hath not caſt away his people which he foreknew.* 3. From a parallel Scripture, out of 1 *King.* 18. which parallel he firſt lays down, *verſe* 2, 3, 4 *Wot ye not what the Scripture ſaith of* Elias, *how he maketh interceſſion to God againſt* Iſrael, *ſaying, Lord they have killed thy Prophets, and digged down thy Altars, And I am left alone, and they ſeek my life? But what ſaith the anſwer of God unto him? I have reſerved to my ſelfe ſeven thouſand men, who have not bowed the knee to the Image of* Baal. And afterward applies, *verſe* 5. *Even ſo then at this preſent time alſo, there is a remnant according to the election of grace.* And ſo falls into a digreſſion concerning grace and works, *verſe* 6 to the 11. 2. He ſpeaks to the Gentiles, and to take down their inſultation over the Jewes, he ſhewes that this rejection of theirs is not final. And this, as the former, is 1. Aſſerted, *verſe* 11. *I ſay then, have they ſtumbled that they ſhould fall?* (*viz.* irrecoverably fall). *God forbid.* 2. Proved by giving account of a twofold end of this rejection of the Jewes. 1 The call of the Gentile, *verſe* 12. *But rather through their fall ſalvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealouſie.* 2. A more glorious returne of the Jews, in emulation of the Gentiles, *verſe* 12. *Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminiſhing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulneſſe?* Hereupon he falls upon a large diſcourſe of his zeal toward them, and their re-ingraffing, *verſ.* 13, 14, 15. adding

adding the words of the Text, *If the first fruits be holy, the lump also is holy, and if the root be holy, so are the branches.* This *Pareus* makes a farther Argument, for proof that the Jews shall again be called; *Gomarus* makes it an encouragement to the Apostle to endeavour their call, howsoever here is a double similitude, One drawn from the Ceremonial Law, *If the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy.* The other from Nature, *If the root be holy, so are the branches.* The first is only mentioned, the second is largely commented upon. In both we see, 1. A supposition. 2. An affirmation. The supposition is, of the holinesse of the first fruits, the holinesse of the root. The affirmation is, the whole lump is holy, the branches are holy. This last is grounded on a principle in nature universally true, *As is the root, so is the branch*, they are both of one and the same nature; As is the one, so is the other. Which he applies to the state of the Church of God; first to the Church of the Jewes, and that 1. In their ancient estate, when they were a people of God, in Covenant-relation, holy, so stiled of him frequently in Scripture. 2. In their present state, for a great part broken off, and so made no people. 3. In their future condition when they should be called of God, and as it were risen from the dead. Secondly, he applies it also to the Gentiles. 1. In their ancient estate as no people. 2. In their present estate, made a people of God, in the place of the Jewes. 3. In their possible estate, and condition, to be rejected and cast off. On which we may ground several undeniable Positions, some concerning the subject, [root and branch] some concerning the predicate [holy].

Positions premised for the right understanding.

1. Of the root and branch.

First, concerning the subject root and branch, in this place (as by way of Metaphor) set out the estate of parent and childe, ancestor and issue. 2. The whole body of the Church is compared to a tree, to an Olivetree. 3. The root of this tree (*viz.* the first supreme universal root) is *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. Not *Abraham* alone, so Ishmaelites would be of the body. Nor *Abraham* with *Isaac* alone, so the Edomites from *Esau* would have been taken in. But the Apostle in this chapter (from Old Testament-authority) excludes both of them, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, are therefore joyntly the root. 4. The branches of this tree are of two sorts. some *natural*, issuing from the root by descent; others *ingraffed*, put in by way of insition. The Jewes were *natural branches*, descending from the loynes of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. The

Gentiles

Gentiles are branches by *inſition* put into the ſtock, the natural branches being broken off. 5. The fatneſſe of this tree is the glory of Ordinances, of which the whole Church partakes, or as ſome ſay, Chriſt is the fatneſſe, but that is onely as he is tendered in Ordinances, for he walks in the middeſt of the Golden Candleſticks. In which ſenſe onely we may yeeld that Chriſt is that fatneſſe.

2. Of the holineſſe here mentioned.

Secondly, concerning the predicate, *Holy*. There is one and the ſame holineſſe goes through the whole tree, all the branches natural and engraffed through the whole Church, and all the children of it Jews and Gentiles; The whole of this holineſſe is from one Original root, and therefore one and the ſame. 2. This holineſſe is ſuch as is communicable from parent to childe, and neceſſarily communicated, as a root communicates ſap to the branches. This is ſo plaine, that if it be denied, all the Apoſtles diſpute falls. 3. It is no holineſſe of inheſion, but relation, not qualitative, but federal. The holineſſe of the Jewes who were a holy Nation was ſuch; The holineſſe of the Gentiles can be no other. Holineſſe of inheſion is not communicable, but only holineſſe of relation. In holineſſe of inheſion the propoſition holds not, as, *is* the father, ſo *is* the child; who knowes not that holy fathers have unholy children? regenerate parents have iſſue unregenerate.

Theſe things conſidered, it is evident, that, as the father is in regard of Church-ſtate, Covenant-holineſſe, ſo is the childe, both in the Church of the Jews and Gentiles: The father being without, the childe is without; the father being within, the childe is within, *eo nomine*, becauſe a branch of ſuch a root, a childe of ſuch a father, which is a full confirmation of the point in hand, that the childe is in Covenant with the father, and the perſon that actually enters covenant, is not ſolely veſted in it. One ſtands upon the contrary part, and puts it to this iſſue for trial, *Whether this ingraffing be into the viſible Church by profeſſion of Faith, or into the inviſible by Election and Faith*; and concludes, *that it is meant of the Church inviſible*; which if he can make good, I ſhall confeſſe all Arguments drawn from hence (as to this point) are loſt; I would (to avoid impertinent cavils, and quarrels) each Text were brought to ſuch iſſue. I ſhall in the firſt place bring arguments to evince that the breaking off, and engraffing, is reſpective to

the

the Church, as visible, and then proceed to answer arguments from a late hand against it.

1. That ingraffing which is into *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* as a root is not an invisible graffing by saving Faith and Election, This is plaine, we live not by power received from *Abraham*, *Abraham* cannot say he bears us up, in saving graces, and that without sap from him, we can do nothing, But the ingraffing is into *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* as a root. This argument, as is said by one, were of force if *Abraham* were made a root by communication, and for prevention he is put to it to tell us of a root communicating nothing, but an exemplary root, or an exemplary cause of beleeving only; what an exemplary non-communicating root is or meanes, let the Reader Consider.

Arguments evincing the ingraffing to be into the Church only as visible, and the breaking off to be frō the Church as visible.

Secondly, that ingraffing which caused disputation and contention in some, emulation in others upon the sight and report of it, was not by saving faith only into the invisible body, but open, visible, and apparant into the visible body; But this ingraffing of the Gentiles into the Church of God, caused disputation and contention in some, *Acts* 11.2,3. emulation in others, *Deut.* 32.21. *Rom.* 10.19. *Rom.* 11.14. this therefore was into the Church visible.

Thirdly, That priviledge which is not restrained to some few invisible Churches, but is the priviledge of all that are contained in it, and members of it, is not an invisible work upon the heart to a saving change, but only an interest in visible priviledges. This is evident, the invisible work is not in all, *Math.* 22.14. But this, here mentioned is the priviledge of the whole body, as is cleare in the Text, and adversaries are constrained to acknowledge; Therefore the ingraffing is only into the visible body. That priviledge wherein the Jewes while they were a people of God did transcend the Gentiles when they were no people, is the priviledge which these Gentiles have by their ingraffing, this is plain, *verse* 17. But it is the priviledge of Ordinances in being visibly related thus to God wherein Jews did then exceed Gentiles, as hath been largely shewn.

Fourthly, that Faith from which the Jews actually fell, and the Gentiles stood in danger to fall from, is not a saving justifying Faith, entituling to invisible priviledges, but a Faith of profession only

onely giving a viſible title. This is plaine, unleſſe we will maintaine *Bertius* his *Hymenem deſertur*, and aſſert the Apoſtaſie of the Saints. But this Faith whereby the Gentiles are ingraffed, is a Faith from which the Jews fell, and from which they were in danger to fall, *v.* 20.

Fifthly, that reconciliation or ingraffing, which is oppoſite to caſting out of a viſible Church-ſtate, is an ingraffing into the Church viſible; But this reconciliation or ingraffing is oppoſite to the caſting out of a Church-ſtate: This is plain *Matth.* 21 43 It is a caſting out of them that bore not fruit, and not a caſting off inviſible branches.

Sixthly, If the ſtate of the Jewes continued from the Apoſtles time to this day, be an excluſion from a viſible Church-ſtate, ſo that they are no people of God in name, then a viſible Church-ſtate is that which they loſt and the Gentiles gained; This is plaine. The ſtate in which they ſtand being rejected, is their ſtate of rejection; But their condition ſince that time, is an excluſion out of a viſible Church ſtate. This needs no proof: Therefore a viſible Church ſtate is that which the Jews loſt, and theſe gained. I wiſh that theſe arguments to which many more might be added, may be taken into conſideration, and for a cloſe of all, ſeeing it is peremptorily aſſerted that it is manifeſtly falſe, *that the Chriſtian Gentiles were graffed into the ſame viſible Church with the Jews, for then they ſhould have been Circumciſed contrary to the determination*, Acts 15. and *that God hath quite taken away the viſible Church of the Jews*, or to that purpoſe. This Error begetting many others, I wiſh that it may be a little better thought upon, whether it be the language of the Scriptures. I have learnt, that as we and they, have one and the ſame God; one and the ſame Faith, that is, the doctrine of Faith, one and the ſame Covenant, eat of one and the ſame ſpiritual meat, and drink of the ſame ſpiritual drink, one and the ſame expected heaven, ſo we are one and the ſame Church. Let us to that end further obſerve the manifold *Metaphors* by which the Church, ours, and theirs, is ſet forth, all of them holding forth this Oneneſſe.

First, That of a *Tent* which is the habitation of ſojourners, *Gen.* 9. 27. *God ſhall enlarge* Japhet, *and he ſhall dwell in the Tents of* Shem, *and* Canaan *ſhall be his ſervant.* *Shems* Tents muſt be

poſſeſt

possest by *Japhet*, and not others built for their habitation, The Tents of *Shem*, that is, his posterity by *Abraham* (which *Japhet*, that is, the Gentiles by a special blessing did possesse) is the Church visible, as needs no proof; *Shems* Tents, and *Japhets* Tents are one, and the same, *Japhet* comes to *Shems*, not *Shem* to *Japhets*.

Secondly, That of a *Sheep-fold*, John 10. 16. *Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd,* The Sheep that in present were in the fold, *viz.* Jews, and those not yet taken in, *viz.* Gentiles, all make up one and the same fold; which though some may limit to the Church invisible, because Christ gives notes of those that are indeed his sheep. but that is no argument at all; Christ speaks to those that were disciples only according to profession, and gives notes, of disciples indeed; and it is against all reason, that Christ should in discourse point out the invisible Church with the demonstrative *This*, and that to those that were malignant enough in the Church visible, namely the Pharisees, as appears in the close of the former Chapter. And the mention of *thieves creeping into it, hirelings employed in it* doth contradict it. The visible Church of the Jews and Gentiles, in which Christ hath true sheep for whom he dies, and others that theeues and hirelings do deceive, makes up one sheep-fold.

Thirdly, By a *natural body*, 1 Cor. 12. 13. Mans body most aptly to this purpose, that one *new man*, Eph. 2. 15. is the visibly body compact of both Jew and Gentile.

Fourthly, to adde no more, that of a Kingdome, *Mat.* 8. 11. *Many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with* Abraham, Isaac *and* Jacob *in the Kingdom of Heaven.* The same Kingdome that Jews leave, Gentiles enter, *Matth.* 21. 41, 43. *The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a Nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.* That can be no more then the presence of God in Gospel-Ordinances, which is without fruit among Jewes (all invisible Members bring forth fruit) and upon that account is given to the Gentiles; Neither is it of force that which is said against it, *Then we must be circumcised.* As though we may not be in the same Kingdom, and yet under a new way of Administration, Law-givers on earth, are sometimes pleased to

change their Lawes, and ſo doth the Law-giver of Heaven; or if he will limit his inſtance to Circumciſion, taking in no other Lawes, the ſame houſe may have a new doore or porch; let our oppoſites then know that they are in the ſame viſible Kingdom, as *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob* and their poſterity after the fleſh in *Iſrael* were, and I wiſh that they may take heed of making diviſions in it or ſeparations from it.

CHAP. L.

Arguments from a late hand for ingraffing into the Church inviſible, and breaking off from it, anſwered.

Argument. 1.

FIrſt, *That ingraffing which is Gods act by his ſole power, is into the inviſible Church by Election and giving Faith. For graffing into the viſible Church, is admiſſion into viſible Membership, which if it be by an outward Ordinance, is the eaſie act of the Adminiſtrator; if by profeſſion of Faith, the eaſie act of the Profeſſor. But the ingraffing meant,* Rom. 11. *is Gods act from his ſole power, as is proved from* verſe 23. *where the reaſon is rendred why the Jewes ſhould be again graffed in, is becauſe God is able to graffe them in again,* Ergo *the graffing here is into the viſible Church.*

Anſw. This ingraffing is by a power of God, working the heart to a profeſſed ſubjection to the way of God in Ordinances tendered, and aſſent of heart unto all that is there promiſed; that power that brought *Japhet* into the tents of *Shem*, Gen. 9. 27. That hand of the Lord that was with thoſe that preached the word, *Act.* 11. 21. ſo that a great number beleeved and turned to to the Lord, muſt bring the Jews back into their former Church-condition. How eaſie ſoever you take this work to be, to bring a people who are ſtrangers to God into a Church-ſtate; yet our Brethren in *New England* have not found it a work ſo eaſie to bring the Natives here into a Church-condition, nor is it ſo eaſie a buſineſſe to bring in the Jewes to this poſture of a viſible Church-ſtate. Have ſo many prayers been laid out for this

work,

work, and it is yet not done? when it is a matter of ſuch eaſe with man, and no need of the power of God for the doing of it.

We underſtand a diſcipling of Gentile-Nations, and acknowledge it a work, above the power of man, and confeſſe it ſolely to be in the hand of God. We do not ſpeak of the bare admiſſion of men that ſtand entitled, but the working of them to ſuch a title, and if an outward profeſſion be in the power of mans will, yet to bring men, or Nations to ſuch a profeſſion, cordially to imbrace the Goſpel, ſo far as to aſſent to the truth of it, is above man, and a work of no ſuch eaſe.

Argument 2.

Secondly, *That ingraffing which is called reconciliation, oppoſite to caſting away, that is by Election and giving Faith, for no other acts can reconcile; But the ingraffing here is called reconciliation, oppoſite to caſting away*, verſe 15. *as may appear in that*, verſe 16. *is a reaſon of the clauſe about the reception of the Jews*, verſ. 15. *and the* 17. verſe, *is an admonition from the ſuſpition*, verſe 15. *that the Jews were caſt away, which is called breaking off*, v. 17. *Now if breaking off*, verſe 17 *be the ſame with caſting away*, verſe 15. *then ingraffing is the ſame with reconciliation*; Ergo *ingraffing is by Election and giving of Faith.*

Anſw. Reconciliation is either gradual, or total, Either to take in, or hold a people in viſible communion, or elſe to receive them with an everlaſting delight in them. The former of theſe *Moſes* obtained for the people of *Iſrael*, when the Lord upon the ſinne of the golden Calfe, ſaid; *Let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot againſt them*, Exod 32.10,11,12,13,14. This being premiſed, if any were at fault for a full anſwer, he might eaſily finde it in the objection it ſelfe. Reconciliation is oppoſite to caſting away. The Jewes then by reconciliation are brought into that ſtate, out of which they were once caſt; But they were not caſt out of the Church inviſible; not out of Election and juſtification, but out of a viſible Church-ſtate and fellowſhip. Breaking off, is rightly ſaid to be the ſame as caſting away, and reconciliation the ſame, as ingraffing. Their reconciliation, or ingraffing is, then, into that condition, from which they were broken, out of which they were caſt: Now they were caſt out of the

Church viſible, not out of the Church inviſible, Their reconciliation brings them into the ſame Church-ſtate, which is a reconciliation gradual, not total.

It is here ſaid, *When any ſhall ſhew either a Scripture, wherein by reconciliation to God, is meant bare vonchſafing a viſible Church-ſtate; and by caſting away, and breaking off, a loſſe of viſible priviledges, or any approved Writer in the Churches of the Proteſtants ſo expounding it, I ſhall begin to ſuſpect that I am miſtaken, but till then, I ſhall remaine confident I am in the right, and ſhall wonder that any that loves not to wrangle, but feares to pervert the Scripture and the truth of God, ſhould dare ſo to interpret it.* Here I may have many things to ſay.

1. When this Authour pleaſes he can heap up phraſes which are onely once uſed in a ſelect ſenſe in Scripture, and that to uphold this interpretation of holy and unclean, 2*Cor.*7.14. when the context clearly evinces the contrary.

2. When he pleaſes, he dare undertake the defence of an opinion held unanimouſly by all Papiſts, and as unanimouſly oppoſed by Proteſtants, as in that of Covenant-holineſſe.

3. *Gomarus*, Tom. 1. p. 111. obſerves, that *World* is taken in that ſenſe in *Rom.* 11 12, 15. as in no other Scripture.

4. If reconciliation in no other place be ſo uſed, yet little is gained; ſeeing as we have ſeen, there are parallel phraſes that hold out the ſame thing to us.

5. I ſhall gratifie him with an Authour, an approved Writer in the Proteſtant Church, that ſo interprets this text in hand, that by reconciliation to God is meant no more then vouchſafing a viſible Church-ſtate. It is *Ravanellus* who having in his laborious work, *Theſaurus Scripturæ* diſtinguiſhed of a *, *twofold reconciliation.* 1. *Of man with God.* 2. *Of man with his neighbour.* And defining reconciliation according to our Authours ſenſe

* *Reconciliatio eſt duplex 1. Hominis cum Deo. 2. Hominis cum proximo.*

Reconciliatio hominis cum Deo, quâ amicitia, quæ in prima creatione hominis cum Deo Creatore interceſſerat, & propter hominis offenſam in Deum ſoluta fuerit adeò ut inimicitiæ ſequutæ eſſent, redintegratur per mediatorem. De qua quidem reconciliatione notanda veniunt. 1. Nomen. Reconciliatio hominis cum Deo ſumitur vel propriè in ſignificatione prædicta, vel minus propriè, ut Rom. 11. 1. (Prov. 15. *errore typographi*) *ubi per reconciliationem mundi cum Deo intelligitur Gentium ad fidem Chriſti converſio, ſeu ipſarum vocatio ad participationem gratiæ Dei, quæ etiam ſalus Gentium,* ver. 11. *& opulentia mundi,* ver. 12. *dicitur.*

of

of it, he goes on and ſaith; *Where we are to conſider. Firſt, the name which* (ſaith he) *is taken either properly in the ſenſe already ſpoken to, or leſſe properly*, Rom. 11.15. *Where by reconciliation of the world to God, is underſtood the converſion of the Gentiles to the faith of Chriſt, or they are call to the participation of the favour of God, which alſo is called the ſalvation of the Gentiles*, verſe 11. *and the riches of the world*, verſe 12. Here he may ſee [Faith] taken for a bare dogmatical Faith reaching a viſible Church-ſtate and not juſtifying; [Reconciliation to God] taken for the grace and favour of Church-priviledges, And the [ſalvation of the Gentiles] and [riches of the world] interpreted to ſignifie the ſame thing. Theſe phraſes are *Synonima*, and they ſignifie a reconciliation not properly ſo called; but ſuch a one that is oppoſed to the Reconciliation for which he contends. And for the other phraſe, that by caſting away, and breaking off, is meant a loſſe of viſible priviledges, let him conſult the laſt Annotations to thoſe words, *verſe 22. Otherwiſe thou alſo ſhalt be cut off*, which they enterpret, *as an unfruitful branch*, adding this caution, as though they had foreſeene this Gloſſe, *But here it is to be noted, that this paſſage ought to be underſtood of the outward incorporation into the Church by profeſſion, whereof many hypocrites do partake, and not of the inward and efficacious ingraffing into the myſtical body of Chriſt by a lively Faith, and the communion of the Spirit according to the election of God, which is ever accompanied with perſeverance.* Doctor *Featly* in his *Pelagius redivivus* hath theſe words which being ſo pertinent, I ſhall tranſcribe, Second parallel, *p* 38. *To the place alledged*, Rom. 11.19,20. *We Anſwer* (ſaith he)

"Firſt, that it is not meant of particular Beleevers, and their "danger of falling away from juſtifying Faith; but of the people "of the Gentiles in general, and their danger of being cut off "from the true Olive into which they were ingrafted, that is, "from the outward profeſſion of Faith, and communion of the "Catholick Church into whith they were admitted upon the re"jection of the Jewes. The Gentiles therefore ought not to be "high-minded againſt the Jewes, but fear; leſt God who ſpared "not the natural branches, ſhould not ſpare them but cut them off "alſo as he did the natural branches, if they ſhould grow proud, "and preſumptuouſly ſecure. Now there is no queſtion but that

"a

" a viſible Church, which at this time profeſſeth the truth and
" is a Member of the Catholick Church, may fall away from the
" outward and publick profeſſion of faith, and ceaſe to be a part
" of the Catholick viſible Church, as the moſt famous and
" ſometimes flouriſhing Church in *Greece*, and *Aſia*, planted by
" the Apoſtles themſelves; (now over-runne with Mahometa-
" niſme, Idolatry, and Hereſie) prove by their lamentable A-
" poſtaſie, deplorable, if not deſperate eſtate. But *Bertius*, and
" the Appealer ſhould have their eyes upon the mark, and
" point in queſtion, which is not in the doctrine of Faith, but of
" the habit of faith; not *de fide quam credimus*, but *de fide quâ cre-*
" *dimus*, not of the publick profeſſion of a Church, but of a parti-
" cular affiance of every true beleever in Chriſt. A Member of
" the viſible Church may be cut off, but no Member of the invi-
" ſible, for Chriſt cannot have *damnata membra*, any Members
" who ſhall not be ſaved, as the approver of the Appealers book,
" rightly gathereth out of Saint *Auſtine* in his reply to *Fiſher*. A
" Church or Kingdome generally may depart from the Chriſtian
" Faith, or renounce the pure profeſſion thereof in publick, and
" yet no true Beleever either totally or finally loſe his Faith; but
" either ſecretly in that ſtate or Kingdome, or elſe-where open-
" ly he may retaine both Faith it ſelf and the profeſſion thereof.
" So *Peter Martyr* Loc. Com. pag. 491. *ſpeaking to thoſe words,*
" *Be not high-minded, but fear.* Neither (ſaith he) is there here
" ſpeech concerning particular men, but of the whole company
" and body of beleevers; deſervedly therefore the Apoſtle doth
" warne them, *Be not high minded, but fear.* For as the Church
" of the Jews hath ceaſed to be, and alſo *Africa*, *Græcia*, and
" *Aſia*. have loſt many Churches; ſo it is to be feared, leſt the
" ſame may now happen to Churches which ſeeme to ſtand, let
" them not therefore lift up themſelves. *Bucar on the words*,
" Thou ſtandeſt by faith, *ſaith*, He ſpeaks of the generality of
" Jewes and Gentiles, and upon theſe words; *Be not high-minded,*
" *but fear*, ſaith, He ſpeaks to the Gentiles in general, from ma-
" ny of whom (as is to be bewailed) the Kingdom of God is taken
" away, as at firſt from the *Jews*, as *Perſians*, *Arabians*, *Syrians*,
" *Egyptians*, *Aſians*, and many others; ſo that this Authour
hath loſt not only this Argument, but this whole Text; For if *Re-*
conciliation, *World*, *Riches*, be thus underſtood, and *cutting off*

in

in like manner, then he sees this Chapter in the whole against him, and in no part for him. And if any Writer against Arminians understand by the *World*, *Rom.* 11. 15. onely the Elect, (unlesse they mean an Election into a Church-state) they do but give advantage to them; there is not meant universally, the whole world, that is too large, nor yet they, that shall be eternally saved out of the world, that is too strict; but the men whom God perswades of *Japhet* to dwell in the Tents of *Shem*, all Nations dispersed through the world, at the last Annotations on *verse* 12.

Argument 3.

Thirdly, *The ingrafting must be meant of that act whereby the branch stands in the tree, as a branch; this will none deny, it being the very* terminus *of ingrafting, as heat, the* terminus *of* calefaction, *but that is by giving Faith*, Ergo. *The minor is proved from* verse 20. *where it is said, By unbelief they were broken off, but thou standest by faith; whence I argue, That act whereby the branch stands in the tree as a branch, must be the giving that means whereby the branch thus stands: But that is Faith*, v. 20. Ergo *the act of ingrafting is by giving Faith.*

Answ. Here I shall willingly grant the conclusion, and do affirm that it is by Faith, that grown persons, whether Jews or Gentiles do stand in a visible Church-fellowship; Such a faith upon which all called ones, (among which few are Elect) are admitted. Such a faith that gave *Simon Magus* title, that *Hymeneus* had, of which he made shipwrack, 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. Doctor *Featley* in the words above mentioned, shewing *Bertius* and the Appealer their fallacy; shews this objector his. The Apostle speaks of the Doctrine of Faith, this objector of the habit. The Apostle speaks *de fide quam credimus*, this objector speaks *de fide qua credimus*. The Apostle speaks of the publick profession of a Church, He of a particular affiance of every Beleever in Christ. He addes, *This conceit I conceived, and still think is so farre from the Apostles expressions, that there seems to be no shew of such a sense in the words*; giving in his reason, *For there is not a word of taking into the Olive, but by Faith*, verse 19, 20. There is indeed here no shew of reason unlesse it can be affirmed, that there is no faith,

faith, but the Faith of the Elect, and that which is juſtifying; therefore if it pleaſe the Authour, I ſhall enter the liſts with him in theſe three *Poſitions*.

1. That Faith is taken in more acceptions then one in Scripture; All Faith doth not entitle to the Church inviſible, and therefore there is ſcarce ſhew of ſenſe in his reaſon, diſputing from the *Genus* to the *Species affirmativè*, or from the *Analogum* to the *Analogatum*.

2. That the Faith here ſpoken to, is (as Doctor *Featly* aſſerts) the doctrine of Faith, not the habit; Faith of Profeſſion, and not a particular affiance; *fides quam*, and not *fides qua credimus*, and ſo the fallacy is clear; and it will no more follow that the ingraffing is into the Church inviſible, becauſe it is by faith; then it will follow that becauſe bruits have ſouls that therefore they have reaſonable ſouls.

3. That there is no ſuch thing in all Scripture as ingraffing into the Church inuiſible by Faith; All ingraffing is into the body viſible, and therefore by a faith of profeſſion. (1.) All ingraffing is into that ſubject, which immediately receives what is ingraffed, as the ſtock receives the ſyens; but it is Chriſt, and not the Church inviſible that receives the Elect Beleever; *Chriſt dwells in us by Faith*, ſo we in Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 3. 17. (2.) All ingraffing is into that which gives ſap and juice to the ingraffed, as the ſtock from the root to the ſyens; Now Chriſt gives ſap to the Elect beleeving, not the Church, and therefore it is not into the Church, but into Chriſt. (3.) If ſaving faith ingraffe the branch into the Church inviſible, then the Church inviſible is the proper object of ſuch Faith, but the Church is no ſuch object of Faith but Chriſt. (4.) That ſuppoſed ingraffing into the inviſible Church, is either known to the body inviſible, or unwitting; if known, then it is no inviſible. They have no light to diſcerne an inviſible work; if unknown, then there could not be ſuch a diſpute about the new ingraffing of Gentiles, nor complaint of breaking off of the Jewes, all being done by an inviſible tranſlation, and ſo the ſubject of the queſtion is taken away. To diſpute whether ingraffing into the Church, be into the Church-viſible, or inviſible; is to diſpute whether the Mount of Olives be a Mountaine of Earth, or Aire. I ſhall aſſoon finde a Mountaine of Aire in *Geography*, as this ingraffing into the viſible

invisible Church in Divinity: And here I tie not any up to the word (which I conceive in reference to any Ecclesiastical or Spiritual station, is not elsewhere used in Scripture) but to the thing. All that accesse to the Church from Gentile Nations, which is so large fore-propheſied in the Old Testament, and Historically related in the *Acts of the Apostles*, was an ingraffing into the Church visible, and this ingraffing here mentioned. The visible Church did immediately receive these new branches, and so the whole body of Jews and Gentiles professedly beleeving, *Ephes.* 2.15. became one new man. The visible Church communicates sap and juice (which is the fatnesse of the Olive) in Ordinances. This is known by the Church visible, they were sensible of, and full of praises, for the new addition to this number.

Argument. 4.

Fourthly, *That ingraffing is meant*, verse 17. *whereby the wilde Olive is co-partaker of the root and fatnesse of the Olive-tree, as is asserted there. But such is only Election and giving of Faith.* Ergo. *The minor I prove by considering who the root is, and what the fatness of the Olive-tree is.* 1. *Negatively the root is not, every beleeving parent.*

Answ. I suppose I may answer for my self, that I never said that every beleeving parent is the *root*; I willingly yeeld that every beleeving parent is not κατ'ἐξοχὴν, the root, but I affirm that every beleeving parent is a root, I cannot reach this mystery, that *Abraham* can be a root of all the branches in *Israel*, reaching down to the Apostles times, no intermediate rootes intervening, no more then *Adam* can be a natural root of mankinde to this time, without intermediate fathers of our flesh, deriving us from him, as *Jacob* with *Rachel* and *Leah* was a root from whom *Israel* sprang as branches of an Olive; so *Judah* and *Tamar*, *Boaz* and *Ruth* were roots likewise: *They built up the house of* Israel, *Ruth.*4.11,12. The house of *Israel* was this Olive-tree, these several Metaphors expressing the same thing, the building of the house, and bringing out the branches are one and the same. All builders are roots; these are builders therefore roots; *Abraham* may be called the builder laying the first foundation, so the root from whence every branch was derived; yet every particular Beleever that had issue, a builder, a root. Those Israelites that had no holinesse of inhesion,

but only of relation that were members of the Church viſible, not inviſible, were fathers by way of communication of this holineſſe, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1. *All our fathers were under the cloud, and all paſſed through the ſea.* It is as neceſſary to have intermediate fathers between us and *Abraham*, as to have intermediate mothers between us and *Eue*. *Eve* may as well be the mother of all living, and no other mother between us and her, as *Abraham* can be the father of the Faithful, and no intermediate father to derive from him, and communicate to us. But his proof is very well worth the hearing, that every beleeving parent is not the root. *For then all the branches ſhould be natural; the childe of every beleeving Parent is a natural branch from his father. But here Apoſtle makes the Gentiles branches, and a wild Olive graffed in beſides nature; and the Jews only natural branches growing from the root*, verſe 21, 24. The Apoſtle makes them wilde onely at their firſt ingraffing, and ſo was all *Terahs* race wilde likewiſe, till that change of Faith wrought in *Abrahams* call, and the covenant of God entered with him; We now are natural as they were, and cannot be called wilde, but in our firſt Original. *Poſitively*, (he ſayes) *the root is no other then* Abraham, *that* Abraham *onely is a holy root, or at moſt* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob. If this have any face of Argument, it runnes thus. *If* Abraham *be the root, and not every beleeving Parent, then the ingraffing is by Election, and Faith that juſtifies.* The truth is, the ſequel is undeniable on the contrary; If *Abraham* be the root, then the ingraffing is not into the inviſible Church, (which he ſtrangely calls by Election) but onely into the viſible. This Maſter *Blakwood* ſaw, and faine would have maintained that Chriſt is the root; for ingraffing into Chriſt, and not into *Abraham*, makes a member of the Church inviſible. If the ingraffing be by a ſaving Faith only, to derive ſaving Graces perſonally inherent, as a fruit of Election from *Abraham*, then it muſt needs be that we are Elect in *Abraham*. *Abraham* may ſay, Without me ye can do nothing, and he that beleeveth in me, out of his belly ſhall flow forth rivers of living water; and we may ſay, The life that we live in the fleſh we live by faith in the ſonne of *Terah*. This muſt neceſſarily follow, if *Abraham* be the root, not only reſpective to a conditional Covenant, but to the grace under condition covenanted; It had been more ſafe for our Authour with Maſter *Blackwood* (though

(though in contradiction to himself) to have made Christ the root; when these consequences must follow; To which he answers,

If I made Abraham *a root as communicating Faith by infusion; or impetration mediatory as Christ, this would follow; But I make* Abraham *a root, as he is called the father of all them that beleeve,* Rom. 4. 11. *Not by begetting Faith in them, but as an exemplary cause of beleeving as I gather from the expression,* verse 12. *That he is a father to them that walk in the steps of our father* Abraham, *which he had yet being uncircumcised.* A root not by communication, but example, an ingraffing, not to have any thing communicated from the root, but to imitate it, is such a *Catacresis* as may well make all Rhetorick ashamed of it; and if the Sun ever saw a more notable piece of non-sense, I am to seek what sense is. A root is too low in the earth, to have its examples followed, and syens suck in juice, but know not how to imitate. And what kinde of root soever any can make it; the root mentioned by the Apostle in that Chapter, is a root by communication, *verse* 17. *If some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wilde Olive-tree wert graffed amongst them, and with them partakest of the root and fatnesse of the Olive-tree.* The root here communicates fatnesse to the branches, and the branches receive from the root. It is then a communicative root, and doth communicate that which makes the branch one with it. *Abraham* is indeed called a father, as well as he is called a root, but these two are not full *Synonima's*, though in the maine they agree, both Metaphors aptly setting forth, what the branches, as from a root, the children, as from a father, receive, namely their title to the Covenant from him; and therefore, as to *Abraham*, so, to all *Israel* appertained the Covenants and the Adoption, *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. And so to all those that are become children and branches with them. The title father is yet extended to a greater latitude, as he doth impart to his issue, (as before) so he is a patterne and example, as even natural parents are likewise, according as *Rom.* 4. 12. it is set forth.

Argument 5.

Fifthly, From *verſe* 25. *If the breaking off the Jews be by blinding*; then *the ingraffing is by giving Faith, but the former is true*, ver. 25. Ergo *the latter.*

Anſw. Here as in the third Argument, I grant the concluſion, and return the ſame anſwer. Jewiſh blindneſſe keeps them out of a Church-ſtate, and ſo from all Faith in the Covenant; and when the vaile ſhall be taken away, they ſhall be reinveſted in a Church-ſtate and Covenant-condition. For proof there is added, πώρωσις *blinding or hardening is*, verſe 7. *oppoſed to that ſtate which the Election obtained, by which*, ver. 8. *they had a ſpirit of ſlumber, eyes that they ſhould not ſee, eares that they ſhould not hear*, verſe 10. *Whereby their eyes were darkened that they might not ſee, from which Anti-Arminians gather abſolute reprobation*, Ames animad. in Remon. Script. Synod. Art. 1. Cap. 16. *Hoc ipſum ad reprobationem ſpectare Apoſtolus* Paulus *clarè oſtendit*, Rom. 11. 17. *Now according to the rule of oppoſites*, Oppoſitorum oppoſita ſunt attributa; *If the blinding be the effect of reprobation, and the breaking off be by blinding, then the ingraffing is by inlightening, and that enlightening is according to Election, and ſo is all one with giving of Faith.*

The propoſition being; If the blinding be the effect of reprobation, and the breaking off is by blinding, then the ingraffing is by enlighteniug, and that according to Election, then the aſſumption can be no other, but that blindneſſe is the effect of reprobation, and the breaking off is by blinding. No one of the *Contra-Remonſtrants* worthy the name of an adverſary of Arminians, hath taught this doctrine: It that which their adverſaries indeed charge upon them, but that which they unanimouſly do diſclaime. I have heard that reprobation is the antecedent of ſinne, but never that it was the cauſe; and that ſinne is a conſequent of it, but never an effect. Reprobation is the Act of God, and in caſe it be the cauſe of blindneſſe, then God is the cauſe of blindneſſe; ſo that the *Contra-remonſtrants* have got a ſweet Advocate to caſt that upon them, that none of their adverſaries (though they have turned every ſtone to do it) could never proue by them. And the other member, that caſting away

way is by blinding, is little better. The Apoſtle ſpeaks in another manner; Blindneſſe was their guilt, and caſting off was their juſt ſentence; *Becauſe of unbelief they were broken off*, verſe 20. upon this account God *God did not ſpare them*, as it follows in the next *verſe*. The work, and the wages, the guilt, and the puniſhment are not one: Unbelief and breaking off, are the work and the wages, the guilt and the puniſhment: Breaking off then, as not blinding. The Apoſtle layes all at mans doore, makes his blindneſſe the moving cauſe, according to that of the Prophet; *Thy deſtruction is of thy ſelf*, and God only the ſevere, but juſt Judge. Our Authour layes all upon God, Gods reprobation cauſes blindneſſe, and their breaking off is by blinding; here is no hand but Gods, in their deſtruction. And now the blaſphemy of the conſequence being denied, ſo that blindneſſe is no effect of reprobation, breaking off being not by blinding; what becomes of the rule of oppoſites here produced? Election and reprobation in the work of ſalvation and damnation, do not *per omnia quadrare*, otherwiſe as Election leads to ſalvation without any merit of works, ſo Reprobation ſhould lead to deſtruction without any merit of ſinne, which *Contra-remonſtrants* unanimouſly deny, though we finde it here affirmed. It is further ſaid, that from *verſe* 8. 10. of this Chapter. *Anti-Arminians gather abſolute Reprobation*, and then explaining what this abſolute Reprobation is, in the words ſpoken to. But though much be ſpoke of the irreſpective decree both between us and Arminians, and alſo among our ſelves: yet I would faine learne what one Anti-Arminian ever made Reprobation abſolute in this ſenſe; *Ameſius* is quoted, but the word [abſolute] is not found in him; And *Gomarus*, a man for the irreſpective decree as much as any (and upon that account entred his diſſent in the Synod of *Dort*, where reſpective to reprobation that was denied, and Sublapſarian opinion eſtabliſhed) yet he peremptorily denies any reprobation abſolute in this ſenſe; (a) *Neither doth God* (ſaith he) *abſolutely and barely deſtinate any man to deſtruction, without ſubordinate meanes; but he deſtinates him to juſt deſtruction, that is by, and for, ſinne juſtly to be executed.* Analyſis Epiſt. ad Rom. cap. 9. p. 60. Neither will he have this decree to effect the ſinne; that is a juſt *Medium* of deſtruction. In the ſame page

a *Neque Deus quenquam ad exitium abſolutè ac nudè ſine ſubordinatis mediis, ſed ad exitium juſtum hoc eſt, per & propter peccata, judicio juſto inferendum deſtinavit.*

page he ſaith; (*b*) *God doth not decree to effect ſin, but to ſuffer; or not to hinder, and to governe for his glory; Neither doth God effect all that he doth decree, but thoſe things which he decreed to effect, of thoſe he is the Authour, as all the good that is done: But the evil which he decreed not to hinder in his creature, that he doth not effect, becauſe he did not decree to effect them; but onely permits, and governs them; and at laſt juſtly, according to his decree, puniſhes them.* And Doctor *Prideaux*, Lect. 1. de abſoluto decreto. (*c*) *That neceſſary diſtinction between the effect and conſequent* (viz. of reprobation) *looſes not a few knots; which many underſtanding, or not duely heeding, are brought into ſtraits by their adverſaries. The condenſation of water (that I may uſe* Auſtins *inſtance) is a conſequent of the abſence of the Sun, not an effect. The ruine of a houſe, of it ſelf tending to decay, neceſſarily follows upon the want of repaire, which the Maſter might do in caſe he pleaſed, but will not, neither is he bound. Sinne no otherwiſe follows upon reprobation; not as a cauſe efficient, but deficient, not whereby any thing is removed that is preſent, but that is not ſupplied which is wanting.* And Maſter *Ball* in his larger Catechiſm, p. 57. *Sin is the effect of mans free will, and condemnation is an effect of juſtice inflicted upon man for ſin and diſobedience; But the decree of God which is good, is the cauſe of neither.* The ſignes of Reprobation may appear in thoſe that are thus diſchurched, according to that which is quoted out of *Ames*, but not as an effect of it. The ſeverity which God ſheweth in not ſparing, but breaking off theſe natural Branches, is explicitely no more then that which Jeſus Chriſt did threaten againſt them, *Mat.* 21 43. That the Kingdome of Heaven ſhould be taken from them, and given to a Nation bringing forth the fruits thereof; the ſame which he threatens againſt *Epheſus*, Rev. 2. 5. in taking away their Candleſtick, which is the effect of their own ſin, and not of Gods decree.

Argu-

b *Deus non decrevit peccata efficere, ſed permittere, ſeu non impedire, & regere ad gloriam ſuam. Nec enim quicquid Deus decrevit illud etiam efficit, ſed quæ decrevit efficere, eorum eſt Author, ut omnia bona quæ fiunt; quæ autem decrevit non impedire increaturis mala ſeu peccata, ea non efficit; quia efficere non decrevit, ſed permittit & regit tantùm & juſtè tandem punit convenienter decreto.*

c *Non paucos diſſolvit nodos, diſtinctio illa neceſſaria inter effectum & conſequens quam minùs intelligentes aliqui, vel inſuper habentes ad incitas frequenter ab adverſariis adiguntur. Induratio aquæ (ut inſtem cum Auguſtino) conſequens eſt, non effectus: Ruina Domûs alicujus ex ſe labilis neceſſariò ſequitur defectum fulturæ quam ſupeditare potuit Dominus ſi libuerit, ſed nec vult, nec tenetur. Haud aliter reprobationem ſequitur peccatum, non ut cauſam efficientem, ſed deficientem, non quâ removetur quod adeſt, ſed non admovetur quod ſuſtentaret.*

Argument. 1.

Sixthly, *If re-ingraffing of the Jewes produceth ſalvation, is by turning them from iniquity, taking away their ſins according to Gods Covenant, then it is into the inviſible Church by giving faith: But the former is true,* v. 25. Ergo *the latter.*

Anſw. This Argument well husbanded, might haue made three. To the firſt I ſay, that priviledges enjoyed in a Church-ſtate, in Scripture-phraſe are the ſalvation, *John* 4. 22. Seeing Church-members are partakers of ſauing Ordinances, And the fruition of Ordinances under Goſpel-diſpenſations is a great ſalvation, *Heb.* 2. 3. And ſo that Text, *Rom.* 11. 26. *all* Iſrael *ſhall be ſaved*, muſt be underſtood, as the laſt Annotation ſpeaks. *The body of this people in general ſhall be brought againe into a way of ſalvation, and re-iſtabliſht into the Church of the whole* Iſrael *of God, conſiſting of Jewes and Gentiles.* And ſo *Diodate*; *That is, the body in general ſhall be put again into a way of ſalvation, and re-eſtabliſhed into the Communion of the Church.* And ſuch men brought into a Church-ſtate are turned from iniquity partially, from their former way of iniquity, their contradicting and blaſpheming; *having eſcaped the pollution of the world,* 2 Pet. 2. 16. of the world that remaines out of the Church of God. Their ſinne is pardoned *quoad hoc*, and when *Moſes* prayed for the pardon of the ſinne of *Iſrael*, Exod. 32. and God promiſeth it, 2 *Chron.* 7. 14. it is ſo to be underſtood of a National dardon.

Argument 7.

Seventhly, *If the re-ingraffing be by vertue of Gods Election and love, his gifts of calling, then it is into the inviſible Church by Election, and giving Faith: But the former is true,* v. 28, 29. Ergo *the latter.*

Anſw. His Election, love, and gifts of calling did at the firſt put them into a viſible Church-ſtate and condition, *Deut.* 7. 7, 8. *The Lord did not ſet his love upon you, nor chuſe you becauſe you were moe in number then any people: for ye were the feweſt of all people: But becauſe the Lord loved you, and becauſe he would keep*

the

the Oath which he had ſworne unto your Fathers, &c. And the ſame love, election and gifts of calling, now they are broken off, doth re-ingraffe them; If this Argument hold, it was an inviſible Church that was brought out of the land of *Egypt.*

Here our Authour ſayes with much confidence that he queſtions not, *but all Anti-Arminians that underſtand the controverſie, will diſclaime Maſter* Geree *in this anſwer, and acknowledge that the election, love, gifts, and calling meant,* Rom. 11.28,29. *are by faith into ſalvation.* But he is much deceived, Thoſe before mentioned underſtood ſomewhate, and *Diodate* in his Annotations hath theſe words, *God never recals his grace, which by abſolute decree he wil communicate to ſome perſon or Nation, to call them to him, and to have right to his Covenant; Now the election of this people hath been ſuch above all others in the world, who being once called, have and may fall totally and irreparably, which this people cannot, without repentance, that is to ſay, irrevocable, of which God never repents.* (a) *Calvin* on the words ſaith, *This is to be held, that private Election is not here handled, but the common adoption of the Nation, which in outward appearance ſeemed for the time to be loſt, but not cut off from the root.* And preſently after, (b) *The Apoſtle argues that the counſel of God, whereby he once choſe to himſelf that Nation in peculiar, remaineth firme.* And Paræus *in dubio decimo nono* on this chapter underſtands it of the (c) *conſtancy of the love of God towards his own Nation.* And moſt fully in *dubio viceſimo,* where urging *Stapletons* objection (d), *That it ſeems from this irrevocableneſſe of the gifts and calling of God, the aſſurance of grace and ſalvation cannot follow.* 1. *Becauſe, as* Stapleton *objects, and* Calvin *and* Martyr *confeſſe, the ſpeech of the*

a *Tenendum eſt non de privata cujuſque electione nunc tractari, ſed de communi adoptione totius gentis quæ in externa ſpecie collapſa videri potuit, ad tempus.*

b *Contendit* Paulus *firmum & immutabile ſtare Dei conſilium, quo ſemel ſibi illos in gentem peculiarem eligere dignatus eſt.*

c *Argumentum Apoſtoli ad probandam conſtantiam dilectionis Dei erga ſuam gentem.*

d *Videtur ex ἀμεταμελεία donorum & vocationis Dei, non ſequi illa quam nos ſtatuimus gratiæ, & ſalutis πληροφορία.* 1. *Quia fatente Calvino & martyre dictum Apoſtoli, non de ſingulari cujuſque electione, ſed de totius gentis Judaicæ communi adoptione accipiendum ſit. Atqui hæc communis adoptio & vocatio gentis fuit mutabilis, quoniam gens Judaica donis & vocatione illâ excidit.*

Ad corruptelas Stapletoni facilè reſpondetur.

1. *Non negatur, de communi gentis Judaicæ, hoc eſt, fœderali dignitate propriè loqui, & hanc ἀμεταμέλητον in Deo pronunciare Apoſtolum, ſed negatur hinc πληροφορίαν ſingulorum non confici. Imò à minori ad majus firmiſſimè concluditur. Si enim de gratia communi & quidem aliena, Apoſtolus rectè pronunciat eſſe Deo ἀμεταμέλητον, quanto magis de gratia propria fideles idem ſtatuere debent.*

Apoſtle

Apostle is is not to be understood of the election of each particular person, but of the common adoption of the whole Nation, and this common grace of adoption of the whole Nation was mutual, for they fell from this gift. To which *Parens* sayes, *Stapleton's corrupt glosse, is easily answered.* 1. Saith he, *It is not denied, that the Apostle spake this of the Common, that is, the federal dignity of the Nation of the Jewes, and that the irrevocableneſſe in God, is to be understood; yet it is denied (*saith he*) that from hence the assurance of particular persons is not concluded, yea from the leſſe* to the greater *it is firmly concluded. For if the Apostle from common grace do rightly conclude this irrevocableneſſe in God, much more may it be determined from that grace which is proper. Ravanellus* in *verbum Electio*, understands Election in *v.*28. of common Election, as he do also in 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *Amesius* is urged as an adversary yet appears otherwise. The Remonstrants giving two answers to this Scripture. The second is the self-same in substance with *Stapletons.* To which *Amesius* replies *Coron.* page 233, 234. (*f*) *This is their custome, to take one part of a truth, and to abuse it for the overthrow or removal of another*; So that it appears according to him, that they spake truth in the denial of this to be meant of the unchangable decree of eternal Election; but they abuse this truth in about to avoid the argument drawn from it, for perseverance; As Jesuites and Arminians do object it, so their adversaries freely confesse it. I have indeed sometimes in my thoughts doubted, how fitly this Text was brought against Arminians for proof of perseverance and estament of assurance, yet satisfied my selfe according to what hath been said; but (since I had any understanding) never questioned but it was here applied (according to the minde of these Authours) to the National priviledge of ths Jews, the full scope of these Chapters being to dispute the rejection of *Israel* after the flesh, their former dignity, and consequently their future recovery unto the state from whence they were fallen, in which the Gentile-Nations by discipling do succed: let us go no farther for determination of the question, then the preceding *verse*, *As concerning the Gospel, they are enemies for your sakes, but as touching the Election they are beloved for the Fathers sake.* Here is to be enquired. 1. Who were enemies concerning the Gospel. 2. Who the Fathers are, for whose sake they are beloved. 3. What this election is, and then we shall soone see who are beloved

f *Sic illis jam solenne est, partem unam veritatis assumere, câque abuti ad alteram vel evertendam, vel dimovendam.*

for the Fathers ſake. For the firſt, It is not the ſpiritual ſeed that were as concerning the Goſpel enemies, that is the higheſt of contradictions; but, as *Diodate* ſayes, *the Jewes who at preſent time were alienate from God by reaſon of rebellion againſt the Goſpel, which only can unite ſouls to him.* Enemies againſt the Goſpel, are enemies againſt God, which cannot be underſtood of ſpiritnal Iſrael. The fathers for whoſe ſake they are beloved, are the ancient fathers, from whom after the fleſh they did proceed; eſpecially *Abraham, Iſaac* and *Jacob*. The word is διὰ τοὺς πατέρας, *propter patres, for the fathers*; Then Election muſt needs be (as *Paræus* upon the words, *Diodate* and *Ravanellus* in *verbum Electio* obſerve) underſtood of an external grace of the Covenant whereby God choſe this Nation to himſelf, according to that of *Moſes*, Dent. 7. 6. *For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God; The Lord thy God hath choſen thee to be a ſpecial people unto himſelf above all people that are upon the face of the earth*; unleſſe we are elect in *Abraham* to ſalvation, and not in Chriſt. And *Abraham, Iſaac* and *Jacob* are our Mediatours reconciliation; and when the Apoſtle ſaith, *We are accepted in the beloved*, Epheſ. 1. 6. it is to be underſtood of acceptation in *Abraham*; and we are to conclude our prayers not in and through Chriſt, but *Abraham, Iſaac* and *Jacob*; we are not for their ſakes beloved to ſalvation. (g) *Paræus* indeed makes the grace of eternal Election to be ſecondarily here underſtood, *which God* (ſaith he) *depoſited in that Nation, for adopting them into Covenant; he makes it evident* (ſaith he) *that he hath many of that Nation, and ever ſhall have that are Elect unto ſalvation.* But this is not the Election here mentioned, but only an adjunct of it; and now of it ſelf it will follow that theſe beloved for *Abraham, Iſaac* and *Jacob* are the children of their fleſh. (h) *Becauſe* (ſaith *Paræus*) *God loved the Fathers, the love extends it ſelf to the children; for if among men friendſhip with parents be divolved to Children, why ſhould it not be ſo with God likewiſe?* I deſire that it may be conſidered for whom *Moſes* interceded, when he prayed; *Remember* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Iſrael *thy ſervants, to whom thou ſwareſt by thy own ſelfe, and ſaideſt unto them, I will multiply your ſeed as the ſtars of heaven, and all this land that I*

g Per electionem intelligit Apoſtolus primo externam fœderis gratiam, qua Deus hanc gentem ſibi delegerat; deinde ipſam æternæ dilectionis gratiam, quam in hac gente quaſi depoſuerat Deus. Nam adoptando eos in fœdus teſtatum fecit ſe ex ea gente plurimos habere, & ſemper habiturum eſſe electos ad ſalutem.

h Quia Deus patres dilexit, etiam ad filios dilectionem ſuam extendit: ſi enim inter homines amicitiæ parentum merito tranſeunt ad liberos, Quid ni Deus idem faceret?

have

have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever. Exod. 32. 13. Was it not the whole body of *Israel*? And for whom is it that God promises to *remember his Covenant with* Jacob, *and also his Covenant with* Isaac, *and also his Covenant with* Abraham, *Levit.* 26. 42. *Was it not the whole Nation under suffering*, as there is expreſt, *I will remember the land*? Either then *Paul* and *Moses* erre, together with the liſt of Authours here mentioned, or elſe, the love, election, calling, in this place is, into a Church ſtate and condition.

Argument. 8.

Eighthly, *If the ingraffing both of Jews and Gentiles be the fruit of Gods mercy, the breaking off by ſhutting up in unbelief, then the ingraffing is into the inviſible Church by election and giving faith: But the former is true*, verſe 30, 31, 32. Ergo *the latter. Anſw.* The priviledge of a Church-ſtate, which the Jewes once had; and againe ſhall have, is a mercy, as may be ſeene, *Hoſea* 1. 6, 9.

Our Author addes, *What ſhall I ſay more? It is ſo plain from the whole ſcope, and tenour of the Apoſtles words, that the ingraffing there ſpoken of is, into the inviſible Church by election and giving faith, that from the firſt of the chapter, to* verſe 13. *there is ſcarce a verſe but ſpeaks of rejecting, foreknowing, election, grace, hardening, giving a Spirit of ſlumber, darkening the eyes, ſtumbling, falling, or ſome equipollent terme to theſe; and the Apoſtle doth plainly ſignifie his intention in all that diſcourſe, to be the ſhewing the myſtery of Gods counſel in electing, reprobating, blinding, converting, one while the Jews, another while the Gentiles: ſo that I cannot but admire that Mr.* Marſhal *ſhould interpret the ingraffing of bare admiſſion into viſible Church-membership.*

Anſw. 1. I would willingly learne what ingraffing by Election is, I take Election to be an immanent act in God, which is terminated in himſelf, and not on the creature; ſuch expreſſions do not ſuit with ſo high pretendings to ſcholaſtical learning, as every where may be ſeen in this Authour.

2. I would have this Argument made up by taking in the aſſumption which can be no other then this. *But the Jewes in their fall from Church-fellowſhip cannot be ſaid to be rejected, hardened, given to a ſpirit of ſlumber, or that their eyes are darkened, or that they have ſtumbled*; neither Election or Grace ſhould have any hand in

their Church-fellowſhip. This muſt be the reaſoning, if there be any ſhew of reaſon in this heap of words, and then all may well admire, while he is in his admiration of others. I ſay no more, but that he is very weak both in Divinity and Logick, that cannot preſently upon the firſt ſight diſcover the weakneſſe, and return a ſatisfying anſwer to this flouriſh of words.

Argument 9.

Parallel places, as is ſaid, *muſt be underſtood of implanting into the inviſible Church*, as *Epheſ.* 3.6. 1 *Cor.* 12.13. *Gal.* 3.14,26, 28,29.

Anſw. Maſter *Hudſon*, page 132. hath not onely affirmed, but proved that the Text, 1 *Cor.* 12.13. is meant of the Church as viſible, to whom I referre the Reader. He places his greateſt confidence in the firſt as he profeſſes, and thus enlarges upon it. *Now ſure the Gentiles were made fellow-heires of the ſame body, and co-partakers of the promiſe of God in the Goſpel, not by an outward Ordinance, but by giving of faith according to Election*; Ergo *the ingraffing*, Rom. 11.17. *parallel to it is not by an outward Ordinance, but by giving Faith according to Election.* To this I onely ſay, O that this were truth: Then as the Apoſtle ſaith of *Iſrael* at their reſtauration, all *Iſrael* ſhall be ſaved, *Rom.* 11. 26. ſo we may ſay, all *England* in *ſtatu quo* ſhall be ſaved in the ſenſe that he would underſtand ſalvation. Whether we be by deſcent *Britaines*, *Saxons*, or *Normans*, we are gentiles and conſequently by his Divinity partakers of the Goſpel, by Faith according to Election, But it is too clear that this Text is meant of Goſpel-glory, in Ordinances diſpenſed by the Apoſtles Miniſtery. And *as to the Jewes appertained the glory and the promiſes*, Rom 9.4,5. So now the glory and promiſes belong to the Gentiles; And as many Jews as fell not off, ſtill enjoy this this glory with the Gentiles and ſo both make one new man, *Eph.* 2.15. The viſible ſtate of the Jews was a diſtinct body from the Gentiles, Now upon this glorious call they are one new man, or new body. For the Texts, *Gal.* 3.14,26,28,29. when any ſhall tell me how they are parallel, then I ſhall give my anſwer, There is an ingraffing into Chriſt mentioned, but none into the Church, and ſo the parallels are without force, as are the Arguments. Two

things

things lie upon him to do, and neither is done. 1. To prove that these Scriptures speak of a Church invisible. That they are parallel with this Scripture. He is wont to reason with his full strength against the force of all Arguments, *à Pari* and yet this argument must carry force from the parity of Scriptures, which he only says, and not at all proves to be parallel, nor yet shews so much as in a word, wherein their parity consists; he well knows that by this means their disparity might appear. There is a tenth Argument drawn from Authorities produced, but to so little purpose that I will not trouble the Readers patience in the recital of it.

CHAP. LI.

1 Cor. 7. 14. Vindicated.

THe next Scripture in which this extent of the Covenant is evidenced, is 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *For the unbeleeving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your Children uncleane, but now are they holy.* In order to a right understanding of these words, the whole scope of the Apostl is to be taken into consideration, which appears to be this.

The *Corinthians* converted by the Apostles Ministery, consulted him by letters in several cases of conscience; one concerning Marriage, a second concerning things offered to Idols, a third concerning spiritual gifts, a fourth concerning collection for the Saints. That of Marriage is first spoken to, and consists of divers heads, and are all satisfied in this Chapter.

The Series of the Apostles dispute opened.

One, among the rest concernes Marriage-estate, between a Beleever an an Infidel, a Professour of the true Faith and a Worshipper of Idols; whether such society may be continued, or must be separated. That this was their Quære, appears by the Apostles resolution, He gives in his answer in the affirmative, both in the case of a beleeving husband joyned to an unbelieving wife, and a beleeving wife joyned to an unbeleeving husband, *let him not put her away, let her not leave him*, only excepting the case of wilful

The *Corinthians* Quære.

wilful deſertion, when for religions ſake the unbeleeving party leaves; Unbelief breaks not the Marriage-bond, renders it not a nullity, (Religion being not of the ſubſtance of Marriage,) It might make null all Covenants, as well as this Covenant, the Law of God ſeeing that condemnes Marriage-Covenants with unbeleevers, condemnes all other Covenants with them, *Deut.* 7. 23. Having determined the point in an univerſal propoſition, or that which is equivalent with it, A Beleever and an unbeleever joyned in Wedlock-bond, are not to be ſeparated, He meets with their ſcruples, and anſwers their objections againſt it; That they had their ſcruples, muſt be confeſt, otherwiſe they had never ſent the caſe to the Apoſtle, And thoſe ſcruples which reaſon it ſelf will ſuggeſt, that have a faire colour in Scripture for them, and are met with, and ſatisfied by the Apoſtle in this his anſwer; we muſt take to be their ſcruples and grounds of their feares, Unleſſe we had the *Corinthians* letter, we have no other way of cognizance of them. And theſe are two.

The *Corinthians* ſcruples.

I ſhall mention the ſecond in the firſt place, ſeeing I am to dwell upon the firſt, and that is their jealouſie of themſelves, of their own ſtanding and perſeverance in the Chriſtian Faith. This in reaſon they might well fear, who ſo active to ſeduce and draw away as a yoke-fellow? and this hath fair colour of Scripture for it, *Deut.* 7. 4. *They will turn away thy ſon from following me, that they may ſerve other gods.* Examples are not wanting, *Nehem.* 13. 26. *Did not* Solomon *King of* Iſrael *ſin by theſe things? yet among many Nations was there no King like him, who was belov'd of his God, and God made him King over all* Iſrael, *nevertheleſſe, even him did outlandiſh women cauſe to ſinne.* To this the Apoſtle anſwers, and oppoſes the hopes of converſion of the unbelieving party; *How knoweſt thou O wife, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy husband? or how knoweſt thou, O man, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy wife?* As there is fear of ſeducing, ſo there is hope of converſion.

The other is the condition of their iſſue, leſt they ſhould not be reckoned with the Saints, but of the fellowſhip of uncleane Gentiles. Reaſon is ſtrong for this, they well knew that as it is with the Parent, ſo it is with the Childe, for Church-ſtate and condition, being a priviledge communicable, and derived by deſcent from Parent to Childe. If the Parent were without, and of the Gentiles

tiles, the Childe was ever such, and in case the parents, were of the people of God, their children were reckoned so in like manner. Now Parents being divided, the one holy, the other unclean, they feared that the issue would follow the worser part, a staine would lie upon them, they would be accounted unclean with the unbeleeving Parent this hath a faire colour of Scripture likewise, and in a like case it had been so determined, *Ezra* 10. 3. *Now therefore let us make a Covenant with our God, to put away all the wives, and such as are borne of them.* The Apostle takes off these fears of theirs, and tells them that the unbelieving party doth not (as they fear) defile the issue, but is sanctified, as to issue, by the Beleever, so that their children are holy, and to be reckoned with the believing Parent, who is a Saint, not unclean, & not reckoned with the unbeleeving parent, who is a Gentile, and so takes off their scruples respective both to themselves and their issue, and quiets their fears. So that several positions might be here laid down for a right understanding of the words.

Explicatory Positions.

1. By [Beleever] in this place is meant, a man or woman professing the true Faith, and bearing the name Christian.

2. By [Unbeleever] is meant, an Infidel, an unconverted Gentile, living in Idolatry, sacrificing to Devils, and not to God, of such the question is put, and not of regenerate and unregenerate, such a scruple was never heard, whether or no such might continue marriage society.

3. To be [sanctified] here, is not to be made holy, which is the case of the Regenerate; or to be set apart for God, which is the case of the visible Saint and Christian; but together with their yoke-fellow to be an holy root to produce an holy seed.

4. By [Holy] is meant, federal holinesse, to be reputed and received among the people of God, who are holy, no other holinesse is transmittible from parents to children.

5. By [Unclean] is meant, a sinner of the Gentiles, an alien and stranger from the Common-wealth of *Israel*.

6. [Else] implies a certainty, that upon this account of sanctification of the Parent (from whom the ground of fear arose) the children are holy, a like certainty that were it not that they were thus sanctified, they were unclean.

Much

The ground or riſe of the *Corinthians* ſcruples.

Much ſtir is made about this doubt of the *Corinthians*, from whence it might ariſe. *In my apprehenſion*, ſayes One, *it is likely that the doubt aroſe from the Epiſtle he wrote before to them mentioned*, 1Cor.5 9,10. *not to keep company with Fornicators, or Idolaters, which might occaſion the queſtion, whether they were then to continue with their unbeleeving yoke-fellow.* To this conjecture I anſwer.

1. That many will not grant that the Apoſtle wrote any Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* before this; but as this carries the title of the firſt, ſo there was none before it; and this they do, to make it good that no Scripture given by divine inſpiration is loſt; which would impeach (as they feare) both the providence of God, and the faithfulneſſe of the Church to whom the Oracles of God were concredited. But let it be granted that he wrote another Epiſtle, which he here mentions; yet the tenth verſe where the ſtreſſe lies ſeems to be his preſent farther explanation of his words there, and no part of the contents of that Epiſtle formerly written, and ſo there is no roome left for this conjecture. But put the caſe, that the ninth and tenth verſes do both expreſſe the Contents of that Epiſtle, yet why do they take both the ends, and leave out the middle? Making their converſe to be with Husbands, or Wives, Fornicators or Idolaters, and not as well with Covetous, or Extortioners? It is anſwered, *the middle termes* [Covetous and Extortioners] *are left out, becauſe I conceived it ſuperfluous for me to put them in. Their only ſcruple I mentioned, was their converſing with the Idolatrous, or unbeleeving yoke-fellow, becauſe the Apoſtle only reſolves that doubt*, 1Cor.7.12. 13,14. *about which the diſpute I held was, Whether or no they ſcrupled, converſing with Covetous and Extortioners, I could not tell; becauſe the Apoſtle is ſilent about that doubt.* If their ſcruple was concerning converſing with their *Idolatrous yoke-fellows*, upon occaſion of thoſe words, *not to keep them company*, they muſt needs ſcruple their converſing with *Covetous and Extortioners, Husbands or Wives* upon the ſame account, and the Apoſtle being ſilent in his anſwer, it is clear they were ſilent in their letter, and moving no ſcruple, they had no ſcruple; when it is impoſſible for them to ſcruple one upon thoſe words, and not ſcruple all. When the Apoſtle names four evils reſpective to civil ſociable converſe, it is a wilde fancy to imagine that they ſhould ſtartle

startle at one (respective to their marriage-society) and question no more. I farther adde: If this conjecture hold, the Apostle thus writes to the *Corinthians, If any brother hath a wife that is an Idolator, Fornicator, a Drunkard or Extortioner, let him not put her away*, and to this I am answered, *Wise men do not always see the consequent of that principle which they are possest with.* And how comes it I wonder into any mans thoughts, that the *Corinthians* had wit to see the consequence from his warning given of one sort of sinners, and of never a one of the other named with them? It is further said, *If they had the occasion of the doubt from* 1 Cor. 5. 9. *doth it follow that the Apostle must either know that to have been the occasion, or resolve their doubt with reference to it? and if he did, yet there was no necessity he should resolve it in like manner concerning Fornicators, as Idolaters.* If the Apostle did not know it, how comes it now to be known, did he want their Sagacity? If he did know it, there must be a like necessity of resolving the doubt in reference to this, as any other at which they scrupled. And if they doubted of all; why is there a necessity of clearing one, and not all, the Apostle doubtlesse took in every part, and piece of their scruple. *It is likely* (saith one) *the Apostle took in every part and piece of that which is propounded to him as the* Corinthians *scruple indeed; but there was no necessity he should take in every part of that which Master* Blake *may imagine, would have been their scruple if my conjecture hold.* But there was a necessity to take in all that had the same evident ground of scruple, and which every rational man will not onely with me imagine; but certainly conclude (*Hoc supposito*) must be their scruple, Had the Apostle taken in every part of their scruple, the question about divorce so much agitated, would have been determined. It is wonder *B. Howson, Bunney*, and others that say *Moses* permission to put away wives, was in case of Adultery only, could not have hit upon this Text which would have salved all, to this is answered.

If the Apostle had taken in every part of the Corinthians *imagined scruple, and resolved as I would have it; Yet, this doth not here determine the controversie so much agitated, whether the innocent party might marry after a lawful Divorce.*

The full truth is here now spoken, such a resolution had indeed destroy'd the the thing supposed, and there could have been no

lawful Divorce; and when the Apoſtle had determined againſt all Divorce, and had given charge, as concerning the unbeleeving wife, ſo concerning the wife of Fornication, If any man have ſuch a wife, let him not put her away, why ſhould there be any diſpute about it, either reſpective to Divorce, or Marriage after it. But as to this enough is ſpoken.

Having examined that which others by their conjecture would make the ground of their ſcruple; I muſt ſpeak to that which we make the occaſion of it before ſuggeſted, *viz.* that caſe of thoſe Iſraelites, *Ezra* 9. 10 *ch.* who upon their returne from their captivity had married ſtrange wives, and were ordered not to live with them, but to put them away with their children, and here to prevent tedious impertinencies, and to make this piece as brief as poſſible, let me premiſe this as an undoubted truth; That theſe *Corinthians* had their ſcruples concerning their iſſue upon their marriage in their diſparity. That which the Apoſtle ſatiſfies in his Anſwer, that the *Corinthians* ſcrupled in their letter. This no man can deny, for he writes to give ſatisfaction, (as is plaine, *verſe* 1.) to their letter-ſcruples: But we ſee in the Text that he as ſatisfies ſcruples concerning themſelves, ſo alſo concerning their iſſue. 2. Let the Reader know, that I do not peremptorily determine, that the determination of the caſe of the Iſraelites, for their ſeparation from their wives, and putting away their children with them, did occaſion this ſcruple in the thoughts of theſe *Corinthians* thus joyned, with unbeleeving yoke-fellows, But I ſay, it is more then probable, that it did either occaſion, or mightily ſtrengthen it, When they are men known in the Scriptures, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. and did queſtion their own marriage upon the account of the unbelief of their yoke-fellow, and finding a caſe thus determined, both againſt mother and child for ſeparation, how can we imagine but they hit upon it, and were affected with it? 3. I do not ſay that the *Iſraelites* caſe and the *Corinthians* were wholly the ſame, as it ſtood with *Iſrael* then, and with the *Corinthians* now; I know it was not, for then either *Ezra* had been too harſh in ordering a ſeparation; or *Paul* too indulgent in determining the lawfulneſſe of the continuance of their marriage-ſociety, and ſo I may ſay of their children; But I ſay their caſes were ſo like, and ſo ſeemingly paral-

lel,

lel, that it might well occasion the *Corinthians* (thus in conscience concerned) to judge them the same. Their cases somewhat did differ, but the *Corinthians* had need of the Apostles help to see the difference. The cases were the very same in themselves, but different in regard of divers administrations, under which they respectively lived. *He that would make their case the same,* (saith One) *must not vary it in one particular: All Casuists and Lawyers determine a Case to be varied when one material circumstance is varied. The Jews being under the Law of* Moses, *and professing it; the Corinthians, Christians not so, and yet that doubt as if occasioned by that fact, must arise from the doubted force of the Law of God.* This hits right upon the difference between them, which yet argues them to be still in themselves the same, had not times differenced them; whereas he sayes, the Jews were under *Moses* Law professing it, but the *Corinthian*-Christians not so. I hope he will not deny they were under the Moral Law, the Apostle even in this Epistle pressing it upon them, 1 *Cor.* 9.9. 1 *Cor.* 14.34. and it was not so easie for them to determine that the Command, *Deut.* 7. was judicial, purely respecting their relation to those Nations, and so their case by this meanes better then those Israelites, and being not able to determine, their scruple remained, and they sought to the Apostle for satisfaction in it.

Two heterodoxical interpretations of the words, holy, unclean.

Having enquired into these *Corinthians* scruples we are to look further into the meaning of the words, and here we might reckon up variety of interpretations of this Text in Ancient and Moderne Writers, most of which are generally exploded, as to the words *holy* and *unclean*, and therefore I think not fit to trouble the Reader at all with them. Two there are which now appeare especially in competition with this here delivered, which I shall hold forth in this place, that the Reader may judge of either. The first sets up parent and childe, root and branch too high; The second layes the issue too low. The first is, that the beleever here mentioned is an elect regenerate man, not only a Professor of the faith, but a man endowed with the grace of faith, not onely of the Church visible, but of the Church invisible likewise; That the holinesse here mentioned is a real holinesse, that is, an holinesse of regeneration, and the issue of one or both regenerate persons is also such, regenerate. The issue of the

The first interpretation setting up parent and childe too high, examined

unregenerate is (as they ſay) unregenerate likewiſe, An interpretation as far from the Apoſtles minde as that which is fartheſt, and the doctrine fetched from it as untrue as that which is untrueſt. The Beleever here is the man that is not an Infidel, one that is taken off from Gentiſme to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. *Paulinus* (whom *Hierome* ſo much admired) interprets it (as *Hierom* relates his words, *Ep.* 153. of a baptized perſon. The *Corinthians* never queſtioned the marriage between one party, in whom the power of godlineſſe appears, and another profeſſingly of the ſame faith, though not in that ſincerity, There was never ſuch a ſcruple made, but the marriage between a profeſſor of Chriſtian religion, and a Pagan; Neither is the iſſue of a regenerate man, becauſe his iſſue, regenerate; Habits, neither infuſed, nor acquired, are thus communicated from parent to childe. Neither will it help to ſay that this propoſition is not univerſal, but indefinite, which holds *ad plurimum*, but not alwayes; The Apoſtles propoſition univerſally holds, *now are they holy*, not in the opinion of charity, but certainty, where neither are holy, the iſſue, not only *ad plurimum*, but certainly is unclean, not as to the judgement of our fears, but for his preſent ſtate, ſo infallibly. That aſſertion to help this out, that God draws regeneration through the loynes of the Elect, at leaſt for the moſt part (few elect ones but their children are regenerate) is ſuch a paradox that I ſuppoſe very few will receive; And thence to infer the lawfulneſſe of the Baptiſme of all of ſuch birth, becauſe ſome are regenerate (and as then ſurmiſe the moſt, even in the womb, and from the birth) is a bottome that will not bear it. One without any name hath publiſhed a Treatiſe of Baptiſm, and in it impugnes with all his ſtrength Infant-baptiſme. He takes notice of this, and like poſitions of this nature, as our ground of it, and then endeavours the battery of it It hath paſſed ſome yeers without any anſwer, that I know. I could wiſh that thoſe that maintaine it on theſe grounds, would take upon them a refutation. His reaſons to me (the doctrine ſo grounded) are above anſwer. I have often ſaid, if I be brought to theſe mens premiſſes, I ſhall then conclude with the Antipædobaptiſts. It ſo much more concerns thoſe, in that the Author (as I hear) was one of their ſociety, and they ſee how frequently their members that are principled againſt Covenant-holineſſe, and borne in hand that the Goſpel ſtrips us of it, do betake themſelves from them into theſe mens tenents.

The

The ſecond interpretation laies the iſſue too low,, and will have the holineſſe mentioned, to have no reſpect to their ſpiritual or Church-ſtate, but onely their legitimation; They are not baſtards but legitimate, This Text (ſaith One) *doth not ſpeak of federal holineſſe, but of holineſſe, that I may ſo call it matrimonial, ſo that the ſenſe is, your children are holy, that is, legitimate*; adding *whether any in the ages before the age laſt paſt expounded it of federal holineſſe, as they call it, I am not yet certaine*, His arguments againſt our interpretation of Covenant-holineſſe and uncleanneſſe, we ſhall examine, being attended as he ſayes, with many abſurdities; in the mean ſpace let me tell him, that his interpretation, underſtanding the Apoſtle as he doth, (*The unbeleeving husband is ſanctified in the wife, &c.* that is, his ſociety with her is lawful, not adulterous, *elſe your children were unclean*, that is, baſtards, illegitimate, *but now they are holy*, that is, of a birth legitimate, not ſpurious) renders the reaſoning here in this place. 1. Childiſh. 2. Incongruous. 3. Untrue.

The ſecond interpretation laying parent and childe too low.

1. Weak and childiſh, to tell the *Corinthians* if their marriage-ſociety were adulterous, then their children were baſtards, if their marriage were nul, children were illegitimate, This is too low a way of reaſoning und unworthy of the Apoſtle ſuch that every childe well knew before the Apoſtle told them. In that great conteſt about the marriage of *Henry* the eighth, with the relict of his brother *Arthur*, (in which the judgement of ſo many Univerſities was deſired) if one had argued, that in caſe this marrige be a nullity, then the Princeſſe is not legitimate: But the Princeſſe is legitimate; *Ergo* the marriage is no nullity) he would have been looked upon as a ſtrange diſputant.

1. Weak and childiſh.

2. Incongruous To bring phraſes fully anſwering the Church-ſtate and condition of either parents, *beleeving*, *unbeleeving*, (which in the Scripture is holy and uncleane) and yet to underſtand them of holineſſe, and uncleanneſſe of another kinde, of legitimation and baſtardy, if they may be (as I think they never were) ſo called, is meerly incongruous: That theſe words fully anſwer the Church-ſtate of parents, and the Church-ſtate and condition which the children derive from them, is plaine in that parallel text, *Gal.* 2. 15. *Jews by nature*, that is, holy by birth from beleeving parents, not *ſinners of the Gentiles*, not uncleane by birth from unbeleeving anceſtors, So Maſter *Cartwright* on theſe words

2. Incongruous

in his anſwer to the Rhemiſts. *If you will know what this holineſſe of children new-born is, the Apoſtle telleth you, it is through the Covenant to be a Jew by nature, or birth: and if you will farther underſtand what this uncleanneſſe of children is, the Apoſtle in the ſame place telleth you, it is not to be ſinners by nature, as thoſe which are born of the Heathen.* I well know, and acquainted the Reader, *p.2.* of my Birth-priviledge, that the Apoſtles ſcope, *Gal.* 2. 15. is another, *viz.* to prove that Jews and Gentiles have both one and the ſame juſtification, not by works of the Law, but by Faith, but falling upon the mention of the Jewe and Gentile, he gives them characters (as Maſter *Cartwright* well obſerves) fully parallel to that which is here delivered

3. Untrue.

3. The argument thus underſtood, is untrue; The ſtreſſe is wholly laid on the beleeving party, as to the holineſſe of the iſſue twice over; The unbeleever is meerly paſſive in it, when the childe hath legitimation equally from both.

Arguments evincing the holineſſe in the Text not to be legitimation.

Againſt the former interpretation, and for mine, which *Chamier* affirmes to be *Calvini, & omnium noſtrorum*, take theſe arguments. 1. That holineſſe which neceſſarily follows to the iſſue, from the ſanctification of an unbeleeving, by a beleeving yoke-fellow, is Covenant holineſſe, and not legitimation: But the holineſſe in this place of the Apoſtle neceſſarily follows to the iſſue, from the ſanctification of an unbeleever by a beleever; *Ergo* it is Covenant holineſſe, not legitimation. 2. That which is derived from the eminency of one parent above another, and not equally from both, is not legitimation: But this holineſſe is derived from the eminence of one parent (*viz.* the beleeving parent above the other;) *Ergo* it is not legitimation. 3. The reſult or fruit which follows from a beleevers faith is not legitimation: But the holineſſe in the Text is a reſult of the faith of the beleeving yoke-fellow; The minor is evident, ſeeing faith is twice hinted at in the beleever. I know that there is one that denies, that the unbeleeving husband, or wife is here ſaid to be ſanctified in the beleeving; It is (ſaith he) *in the husband, not in the beleeving husband, in the wife, not in the beleeving wife, that is not in the Text.* The marriage is between a beleever and an unbeleever, the unbeleever is ſanctified whether husband or wife by their yoke-fellow, but not as is ſaid, by their beleeving yoke-

fellow

fellow; the Reader that puts off his reason may matter such denials.

To evince sense of bastardy and legitimation from those words of the Text, *unclean* and *holy*, the Apostles argument is put by one into this forme, *If the unbeleeving husband were not sanctified by the wife, then were your children uncleane; But they are not uncleane, but holy*; Ergo, *the unbeleeving husband is sanctified by the wife.* And this sequel (as is said) were not true, if this proposition were not true; *All the children of those parents where one is not sanctified to the other, are unclean.* "The Pro-"position is, of an unbelieving husband and a wife, and yet the Pro-"position must be of all parents, that will prove it, as he that will "prove, If an Englishman be noble, he is honourable, must prove "it by this universal or general, All Noble men are honourable, "and not put in all Englishmen Noble, for then the antecedent "and the conclusion would be all one, whereas the Proposition "proving, must be larger then the Proposition proved, else we "might conclude *ex meris particularibus*; To say if the unbeleeving "husband were not sanctified by the wife, your children were un-"clean is all one with this, All the children of the unbeleeving "husband not sanctified to the wife are uncleane. This of it selfe is not such, that many words should need to be spent about it, But seeing that a learned hand, layes so much, and so great stress upon it; It may not be slightly passed over, and who sees not here a wilde parallel well worthy of such a monstrous assertion, The proposition is, of two standing in full disparity, and an instance is given in a single person, where there is no disparity at all, and by two adjuncts which are *Synonyma*: I desire to know how this sequel may be proved, If a wife of an ignoble birth be not made Noble by her husband, her issue is ignoble; must it be proved by this Proposition, The issue of every wife not made noble by her husband, is ignoble? or will it serve, The issue of every ignoble wife not made noble by her husband is ignoble? If a poore man take a wife, and is not enricht by her, he still remaines in a poore condition; shall this be made good by a proposition, That all men taking wives, and not enricht by them are in a poore condition; or will it serve that every poor man taking a wife, and not enricht by her, is in a poore condition? are these true, or are they false propositions. Yea, what is affirmed in his own instance, to prove that if an Englishman be noble

The sanctification spoken to, is not of parents in general, but of one parent beleeving, and another unbeleeving in particular.

noble, he is honourable, it is ſufficient to prove it by this Propoſition; All Engliſhmen noble, are honourable, will not hold. Let any one tell me how he will make good this Propoſition. If a Dutchman be borne of a Duke, he is a Duke; if he be borne of an Earle he is an Earle, muſt it be; All men born of Dukes, are Dukes, of Earles, are Earles; This with us in *England* is falſe, but of all Dutch men thus borne it is truth; But the reaſon given muſt be looked into, *The antecedent and the concluſion* (ſaith he) *would be all one, whereas the Propoſition proving muſt be larger then the Propoſition proved.* But who knows not, that the Propoſition proving is larger here then the propoſition proved. A propoſition expreſſely univerſal, is larger in a Logick argument, then either an indefinite or particular. The Propoſition by him excepted againſt, in Logick conſideration is as univerſal as that which is moſt univerſal; Every Engliſhman that is noble, is honourable, is an univerſal Propoſition, as well as every man that is noble, is honourable; and I never learnt that in the quantity of propoſitions, there is *magis & minus*. I am challenged for ſaying, *The truth of the Apoſtles ſequel depends on this propoſition; All the children of an unbeleever are uncleane, unleſſe for generation he or ſhe be ſanctified by a beleever*; and addes, *I deny it, in that the termes, [for generation by a Beleever] are added by him, not in the Apoſtle, and ſo he changed the termes.* I pray leave generation out, and ſee whether there can be any ſenſe in it, unleſſe it be underſtood; Their ſanctification will confer no legitimation, without generation; If I ſay not beleever, I muſt ſay husband or wife that is a beleever.

The Apoſtle brings not formal arguments to conclude the lawfulneſs of marriage-ſociety, but removes ſcrupples concerning their own ſtate and their iſſue.

Another bottome on which the forenamed interpretation is grounded is, That the Apoſtle in this Text brings a formal argument to prove the marriage ſociety of theſe yoke-fellows to be lawful, which in the two former verſes he had determined, and (as was confeſt before) they ſcrupled, and it cannot be denied but the words at firſt ſight, ſeem to carry ſome colour to underſtand them ſo farre in this ſenſe, as to make them formal, concluding reaſons of his former determination, Having ſaid, *verſe* 12, 13. *If any brother hath a wife that beleeveth not, and ſhe be pleaſed to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman that hath an husband that beleeveth not, and he be pleaſed to dwell with her, let her not leave him*; then he adds, *For the unbeleeving husband is ſanctified*

ctified by the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy. But the way of inference will as well bear it; that the Apostle doth first determine the Controversie by revelation as an Apostle, and then takes off their scruples which occasioned their feares, both respective to their posterity and themselves; This way of interpretation is charged as making the Apostle immethodical, but what better method then to determine a point, and then answer reasons against it; The Apostle meeting with their fears in respect both of their posterity, and themselves, it must needs be that they signified them, and he removes them; The Apostles method (it is true) and manner of inference indifferently favours either interpretation; But the words themselves clearly evince, that they are a removal of scruples against their marriage-society, and not a formal concluding argument for it. Let us look first into *verse* 16. where [*For*] may lay as faire a claime to a formal reason as this in the fourteenth, and such that stand for this interpretation say, it is a formal reason, But I would faine learn how any one can make it up into a reason; He must thus draw it up, whom man in marriage-society may have hopes to save from idolatrous wayes, with such a one he may continue marriage-society; But a beleeving husband in marriage-society may have hopes to save his unbeleeving wife from idolatrous wayes, *Ergo*. This proposition as to such a conclusion is. 1. Vaine, for, though there were no such hopes, yet marriage-society is to be continued, Gentilisme being not of the subsistence of marriage. 2. This Proposition is false as to this purpose; The incestuous *Corinthian* might have hopes to have had converted his fathers wife, (if a Heathen) and yet such hopes would not conclude the lawfulnesse of their society together; *Herod* might have had like hopes to have converted his brother *Philips* wife, and yet this was not objected against *John Baptist*, and had it been objected, it had been frivolous. We have many cases put about marriage, if such an argument would serve the turne, it would salve them all. And for *verse* 14. though I cannot say, but in case it were made up into a reason of the former conclusion, it would contain a truth, and so far might passe in the way of a reason, yet I have many material exceptions against it.

1. From the thing it self, it would be a reason (though true,

yet) ſilly, childiſh, vaine, your married condition is lawful, elſe your children were baſtards; what childe in *Corinth* (as was hinted when I ſpake of the Apoſtles words, as in themſelves that knew the right hand from the left) but well underſtood it? There is not a boy that plays in the ſtreets, but knows that children born out of wedlock are baſtards. There is a Book publiſhed, putting it to the queſtion, and diſputing it, whether marriages beeween profeſſours of the true religion and Infidels, and ſo of Papiſt, with Proteſtants, be not *ab initio*, null, and they to be ſeparated in caſe any ſhall now come in with this argument for the negative, that they are not null, and to conclude their continuance; If ſuch marriage be null; their children are baſtards: But they are not baſtards, *Ergo* the marriage is not null; the Authour or any other might be brought to a ſmile, not to conviction. As *Eraſmus* in his cenſure of thoſe ſuppoſitious ſpurious Epiſtles that have paſt with many for *Pauls* to *Seneca*, charges them with no falſe doctrine, but is bold to ſay, I ſee not what can be ſaid more ſimply or ſenſelelly, and that there is nothing in them worthy of *Pauls* ſpirit; ſo I may ſay of this ſuppoſitious ſpurious interpretation put upon this Text in *Pauls* Epiſtle. *Eraſmus* is deſervedly troubled that theſe Epiſtles ſhould have their verboſous Comments, any may equally be troubled that ſuch a reaſon ſhould finde defence from any hand in ſo many words.

My next challenge is from the phraſe in which it is delivered, altogether unſutable to a reaſon of this doctrine, upon a threefold account. 1. The Apoſtle being onely to tell them, that the legitimation of their iſſue proved the lawfulneſſe of their marriage-ſociety, he ſhould attribute all (as to either ſex) to the beleever, when the childe owes his legitimation equally to either parent, to the unbeleever as much as the beleever. 2. That being to give reaſon of the lawfulneſſe of marriage in ſuch a ſpecial caſe, he ſhould give his reaſon of equal concernment to all marriages, where both are unbeleevers, both beleevers, as well as this between a beleever and an unbeleever. 3. When he is to ſpeak only of legitimation and baſtardy, he ſhould praiſe it in ſuch uncouth language, and in words ſo ironely ſutable to their parent, Eccleſiaſtical capacity, whether title to it, as in the beleever, or want of it as in the unbeleever; now, on the other hand interpret the

A-

Apostles words (as his method will equally bear) accordingly as you have heard before, and no such inconveniency follows from the words either *verse* 14. or 16. And now our adversary may easily receive an answer to that odious inference, which he makes from our interpretation of Covenant-holinesse: *According to this interpretation* (saith he) *the* medium *of the Apostle to prove the lawfulnesse of the living of a beleeving wife with an unbeleeving husband, will as well prove the lawfulnesse of a beleeving fornicatrix with an unbeleeving fornicator, as may appeare* (saith he) *by a Syllogisticall Analysis of the Apostles argument, the major whereof is this, That man and woman may live together, notwithstanding the unbelief of one party, whereof one is sanctified to the other for begetting an holy seed.* This is manifestly the Apostles reason, he sayes after our interpretation. But he is manifestly mistaken; not to mention the liberty that he will scarce allow another to leave out husband and wife expresst in the text, and instead of it to put man and woman: The Apostle doth not conclude the lawfulnesse of their marriag-society by the federation of their issue, but shews that the supposed and feared non-federation doth not conclude the unlawfulnesse, and I dare yeeld that any man and woman may live together, notwithstanding any feare of the unholinesse of their issue; where one is sanctified by the faith of another, to the begetting of a seed federally holy. And if he will apply this, which the Apostle speaks, of a mans living with his wife (*ad faciendum populum*) to the living with his whore, there is no danger to yeeld it; *Pharez* his issue had belonged to the Common-weale of *Israel*, if *Tamar* had been an Infidel, as for ought we know, and in all probability it was, with *Jephthaes* mother. If *Sampson* had issue by the Harlot of *Gaza*, Judges 16. 1. such issue had belonged to *Israel*, such issue male had right to Circumcision. To gratifie him I shall put it under my hand, that if a man have no other reason from Scripture to leave his Harlot then the non-federation of his issue, he may still abide with her, and that he is not bound upon that sole account to desert her. If any shall attempt to keep up these two maine propositions by me examined, on which the whole fabrick of a long discourse is built, for to make good the interpretation mentioned, and refute the arguments against it, I shall readily and willingly look into it, which for several yeares I have waited, till then I shall con-

conclude that federal holineſſe and not legitimation is here intended.

A vindication of inſtrumental ſanctification.

A mighty ſtirre is here further made about inſtrumental ſanctification, and arguments heaped by Maſter *Tombes* againſt it, the moſt of them grounded upon thoſe two Propoſitions (which he would have his Reader beleeve that I confeſſe, when he cannot prove,) *That all the children whereof one parent is not ſanctified to the other are unclean; none of the children whereof the one is not ſanctified to the other are cleane*, together with the other, *That this is a concluding formal reaſon to prove the lawfulneſſe of their abode together*; upon this account it is affirmed that our interpretation hits not the caſe of perſons diſabled from procreation, it makes the Apoſtles argument to be from a future contingent, *I appeal to any Logician and Grammarian whether a perſon may be ſaid to be inſtrumentally ſanctified for ſuch an effect which he neither doth nor can produce? Whether a woman may be ſaid to be ſanctified* quoad hoc, *ſo farre as to bring forth an holy ſeed, by vertue of the faith of her husband, who is by age or accidental impotency utterly diſabled naturally from bearing any children, and hath no ſupernatural power enabling her thereto? whether ſhe may be capable to bring forth an holy ſeed, who is not capable to bring forth any at all? bringing forth an holy ſeed cannot be without bringing forth a ſeed, and therefore the woman uncapable to bring forth a ſeed is uncapable to bring forth an holy ſeed.* And *I* on the contrary appeal to any, yea, the meaneſt Chriſtian whether perſons that have children born in wedlock-bonds, in ſuch diſparity may not have their fears and ſcruples about them, notwithſtanding other in the ſame condition of marriage are childleſſe, or unable to bring forth children? Whether the ſeed which came of thoſe marriages, *Ezra* 10. were not uncleane, notwithſtanding many ſo married had no children? many of the Prieſts had herein tranſgreſt, and it was but *ſome of them that had wives by whom they had children*, Ezra 10.44. And becauſe this is the *medium* for proof of the Apoſtles determination, *verſe* 13. that they might live together, it muſt needs be from a future contingent; but when this is no *medium* for proof of the Apoſtles determination, as hath been ſufficiently ſhewn it is not, this falls with the other.

Two arguments againſt inſtrumental ſanctification I ſhall take notice of, which ſeeme to have ſome other bottome.

1. *That*

1. *That the act of producing an holy seed is not from any special designation of God, and therefore cannot be meant of instrumental sanctification, seeing an instrument must be the instrument of the principal agent which can be no other then God*; I am sure they bring forth children unto God, *Ezek.* 16. 20. and this they do not independently of themselves, so Christ would not have warned, *Matth.* 23. 10. *Call no man father upon earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven.* All natural parents are instruments of God to produce a seed to people the world, according to that blessing of *Gen.* 1. 28. *Gen.* 9. 1. *Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth*; All beleeving parents are instruments of God for an holy seed, it being of his free grace that the promise is to them and their seed.

The second argument is that *many a child of both unbeleeving parents are federaly holy*; and being answered that they are not so at their birth, if afterwards by grace they are changed, this is no fruit of their birth (of which the question is in this place) but the work of the Gospel through grace. It is replied, *This is nothing to the purpose, sith the Proposition hath not those words in it, nor the Apostle; the Apostles reason supposeth it cannot be at any time*; It seemes then that Apostles Proposition hath this in it, that their children so borne, are unclean by birth and for all eternity shall so remaine never to be cleansed, or else this exception is lesse to purpose, who does not see that the Apostle speaks uncleanesse or holinesse as a product of their birth? without consideration of any thing which after by providence (through the omnipotence and free grace of God) might happen, as a mean woman given in marriage to a Senator or Peer, she is enobled by her husband, otherwise her issue were plebeians, yet so as they are capable of honour by the Princes munificence, or their own merit; It seems that Proposition of Christs, *That which is borne of the flesh*, John 3. 6. will not hold, unlesse it must for ever continue flesh, and no omnipotence of God shall be able to make it othe(wise. It is further said, *and yet it may be certain that the child of two unbeleevers may be federally holy at birth, whether it be understood of Election, inherent holinesse, or outward holif God please to work, and declare it.* To this I onely say, let that proposition stand, till God by such a miracle confute, or contradict it, and whensoever he shall thus own such unclean infants as federally holy, I shall be silent.

It

It is farther said, *But the issue of them that are not lawfully conjoyned as husband and wife, cannot be made legitimate by God, because it is contrary to the definition of legitimation, which is a state consequent upon birth by the lawful copulation of lawful husband and wife.* So that the reply is brought to this, because God by his omnipotence can make our uncleane ones holy, and to make their uncleane ones holy, is without the verge of omnipotence, therefore his interpretation stands and ours must fall. If we should put case in their manner, that God should appear in approbation of a mans enjoying a woman out of marriage-society, then there were a legitimation of the issue, as he did the marriage of the brothers wife, *Deut.* 25.5. otherwise against the moral Law, *Levit.* 18.16. Or as some understand it, the Prophets taking a wife of whoredoms.

CHAP. LII.

Gal. 4. 29. Vindicated.

THe next Scripture Text to make good the point in hand, is *Gal.* 4. 29. *But then he that was borne after the flesh persecuted him that was borne after the Spirit, even so it is now.* For the clearing of which I have observed heretofore in the Apostles words there. First, the History. Secondly, the Mystery by way of Allegory. Thirdly, the parallel by the Apostle observed and applied to his own times.

The Text Analysed.

The History we finde, *verse* 22, 23. *It is written that* Abraham *had two sonnes, the one by a bond-maide, the other by a free-woman, but he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh, but he of the free-woman was by promise.*

The Mystery by way of Allegory, *verse* 24, 25, 26. *Which things are an Allegory, for these are the two Covenants, the one from the Mount* Sinai *which gendereth to bondage, which is* Agar. *For this* Agar *is Mount* Sinai *in* Arabia, *and answereth to* Hierusalem *which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But* Hierusalem *which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.*

The

The parallel in these words, *But as then, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, so it is now.* From whence this argument is drawn, If there yet remaine in the bosome of the Church children borne after the flesh, as well as those that are borne of the Spirit, (so that the distinction of births, as applied to *Abrahams* seed, still hath place among Christians) then there is that priviledge of birth-holinesse still remaining; The consequence is plaine, Birth of the flesh in the Church gave a Church-interest, The Apostles kinsemen after the flesh, *Rom.* 9. 3. were all Church-members. That there is is such a birth yet remaining, the Text quoted makes cleare; *Ishmael* was in *Abrahams* family, and was by birth of his family, and did persecute in the family, and was by birth of his family, and did persecute in the family, as the Apostles shews out of Scripture History, Men in the Church, borne in the Church, by birth-right of the Church, do persecute, as upon experience he affirms, and so makes up the parallel. There birth of the flesh, is the highest honour they attaine; when others have the same with an addition to it; this implies two things. 1. A birth of nature, a childe by lineal descent of such a father. 2. Outward prerogatives that accompany such a birth.

The argumen deduced from it.

I know and have declared that this is not that which the Apostle here chiefly intends, or is about to hold out. But this I affirme, that he occasionally layes down, that which I here have delivered. And by this free concession of mine, any man in reason might have thought, that I had prevented that which is still charged upon that which from this Text I have inferred, or rather that which in this Text I have observed, one largely shewing that these words in hand, *are a compound proposition, which Logicians call a comparative proposition, in which are two parts, a Protasis, and an Apodosis, or rendring, wherein that which answers the fore part, first held out, is expressed, now that always notes some agreement, correspondence, parity or likenesse, whether in quantity, quality, action, &c. But according to my Apodosis or reddition* (as is said) *there is no such answerableness, or likenesse, as hath the shew of a comparison of things equal or alike* (*as this is as the affirmative termes shew*) *for who would conceive any better then non-sense, in such a speech as this, Even as* Ishmael *persecuted* Isaac, *so the children of Christian beleevers are visible members*

in

in the Chriſtian Church. It were all one as to ſay even as Eſau *hated* Jacob, *ſo godly men are heirs of heaven, or have acceſſe to God.* The abſurdity of which with him is ſo groſſe, that the man is amazed that I do not ſee it, nor will confeſſe it. Being above his ſtrength to anſwer that ſenſe, which I give of the words, he is pleaſed to take paines to make them up, by his gloſſe, into non-ſenſe, that ſo no anſwer may need. But he well knows or might know, that I have not to deale with the whole of that *Protaſis*, nor the whole of that *Apodoſis*, and not at all with the perſecution there mentioned, but onely with the diſtinction there let fall, which is a diſtinction of births, both in *Abrahams* family, and in the Church, in Goſpel-times, which the Apoſtle in his Application in thoſe words [*Then*] and [*Now*;] plainly doth demonſtrate. The truth which the Apoſtle ſuppoſes, and takes for granted, I have here to ſpeak to, and not to that, which by way of allegory, he infers from it, or applies to it, and ſo the liſt of authours here brought in, by my adverſary; ſpeaking of the perſecution of Chriſtians, by Jews and Papiſts, may all of them ſpeak truth; but none of them all, any thing againſt me, who deduce no more from the words, but that a diſtinction of births is there laid down, or rather taken for granted, which is by the Apoſtle allegoriſed, but the allegory is not at all within that which I am upon. I met with like dealings, from the ſame hand; when I did compare, 1 *Cor* 7.14. with *Gal.* 2.15 to make good a title to Covenant-holineſſe, by birth of nature, both with Jew and Gentile. I then heard thoſe words of the poet, *Cernimus, an qui amant, ipſi ſibi ſomnia fingunt?* But the evidence of truth, with Maſter *Cartwrights* authority, making them as to thing, full parallel (as to every eye they are) hath there wrought ſome ſilence, ſo I doubt not, but it will follow here. It is not the Apoſtles intention, *Gal.* 2.15 to ſpeak of the birth-priviledg of the Jews, nor yet the want of it in the Gentiles, yet there he mentions both, neither is it his intention to treat of ſuch a diſtinction of births, in the Church Jewiſh or Chriſtian, but the hoſtile diſpoſition of one, ſo born, againſt another, yet in that place he plainly ſignifies ſuch a diſtinction of births in either Church, both Jewiſh and Chriſtian. Can any man deny that *Abraham* had two ſons of ſuch different births, as the Apoſtle from the hyſtory in *Geneſis* ſhews, *v.* 22,23. *Iſhmael* is ſet out as a ſon of *Abraham*, and upon that account we know he had the honour of circumciſion,

Gal. 4. 29.

ſion, *Iſaac* had the ſame, but a degree of further honour with it, being born as *Iſhmael* was not) by promiſe, And whatſoever Allegory the Apoſtle makes of it (which is not to my purpoſe to examine) yet in his reddition or application, he looks at the hiſtory, not at the allegory, as the adverbs of time, *Then*, *Now*, (neither of which are allegoriſed) do demonſtrate. And though *Iſhmael* may be a type of a juſtitiary, ſeeking righteouſneſſe by works, and perſecuting thoſe that ſeek a righteouſneſſe by faith, whether *typus*, *factus*, or *deſtinatus* I will not enquire, yet, I think, it will never be proved; that *Iſhmael* was ſuch a one, in his own perſon, perſecuting *Iſaac* on that account; which muſt be proved, if the Apoſtle in his reddition do no look at the hiſtory, but the allegory as my adverſary contends or elſe he ſpeaks beſides the purpoſe, [*Then*] looks at the hiſtory denoting time, as none can deny, and [*Now*] muſt not referre to the allegory without great abſurdity. My interpretation (as is ſaid) will not hold, in that according to it, there is no agreement, correſpondency, or parity in the parts of the compound propoſition, And I wonder, what agreement, correſpondency, or parity there is, or can be, in the parts of this compound propoſition, according to the interpretation oppoſed againſt me, confounding hiſtory and allegory together. Thus it muſt be, as *Iſhmael* no juſtitiary, then jeered *Iſaac*, a ſucking babe (as my adverſary out of *Hierome* ſpeaks) who was not in capacity to look after any righteouſneſſe, ſo it is now; juſtitiaries perſecute thoſe that do follow after righteouſneſſe by faith. If this gloſſe ſtand it ſhould not be, *ſo it is now*, but rather, *now it is otherwiſe*. He that will come to a right underſtanding of the Text, muſt refer this 29. *verſe* to 22, and 23. looking upon *verſe* 24,25,26,27,28. (where the allegory is proſecuted) as a parenthiſis, ſeeing the words in *v.* 29. cannot be refer'd to the allegory in thoſe words, where there is no mention made of perſecution but to the hiſtory in the former. I am told, that *the Apoſtles diſtribution, cannot be, of a ſubject by its adjuncts, but, of a genus, into its ſpecies, becauſe* [birth] *is neither ſubſtance, quantity, nor quality; but an action, or a paſſion, and actions though they be capable of various modifications, yet Logiſcians (as is ſaid) do not call them ſubjects.* But doubtleſſe the perſon borne, is and may be called a ſubject, and ſtands in a capacity of adjuncts, and I look to the perſons here diſtinguiſhed, ſome with more inferior,

and others with more noble adjuncts. When I cite may Maſter *Baine* (brought in againſt me as an adverſary) ſaying, *The children of the fleſh here, are thoſe onely who in courſe of nature came from* Abraham, *I am told, it is true, that Mr.* Bayne *ſo interprets the terme* [*children of the fleſh*, Rom 9.8.] as I have cited him, *which place he meant, but not the terme* [*he that is borne after the fleſh*, Gal. 4.29.] *yea*, p. 138. *he ſaith, for though children of the fleſh, in ſome other Scripture* (*meaning* Gal. 4 29.) *doth note out juſtitiaries, ſeeking ſalvation in the Law, yet here* (Rom. 9.8.) *the literal meaning is, to be taken, a childe of the fleſh, being ſuch a one who deſcendeth from Abraham according to the fleſh.* But how can Mr. *Bayne* poſſibly meane, Gal. 4 29. (as I am here told he doth) when he ſpeaks of the children of the fleſh, when thoſe words are not to be found there, [but born after the fleſh] and thoſe terms [children of the fleſh] and [born after the fleſh], are in this very place by my adverſary diſtinguſhed. And though Maſter *Bayne* do not quote, *Gal* 4 29. in that place which I mentioned, yet *Doctor* Abbot *in Thomſoni diatribam*, p. 115. ſaith. *Circumciſus eſt* Iſhmael, *circumciſus &* Iſaac, *ſolus autem* Iſaac, *natus ſecundum ſpiritum*, Iſhmael *tantummodo ſecundum carnem, non eſt autem juſtificatus, qui natus eſt tantum modo ſecundum carnem*, Iſhmael *quanquam circumciſus, non eſt tamen juſtificatus, &c.* Here he plainly makes the birth of the fleſh, an honour giving circumciſion, though an honour inferiour to that of the birth of the ſpirit which juſtification accompanies, and he quotes *Gal* 4.29. as a proof of what he ſpeaks, and I am much engaged to my Antagoniſt for his quotation out of *Hierome*, *Sicut ergo, tum, major frater* Iſhmael, *lactentem adhuc & parvulum perſequabatur* Iſaac, *ſibi circumciſionis prerogativum, ſibi primogenita venditans, ita & nunc, &c.* Whence had he this prerogative of circumciſion, but from this birth, that I ſpeak of from *Abraham*, and there is, the like prerogative of birth; ſtill continuing, or elſe there is no parity in the Apoſtles reddition. Here I ſhall take notice of a fourfold abſurdity endeavoured to be faſtened upon me.

1. That I underſtand *this to be ſaid of Infants which then muſt be ſaid to perſecute*. But I underſtand it not of Infants, but of thoſe, which ſometimes were Infants; and had their birth in infancy, from ſuch and ſuch parents.

2. That I take [*being born after the fleſh*] *in the latter part*,

not e

note a natural birth, but that is clean besides the Apostles meaning, who considers persons borne after the flesh, not as borne by humane members and seed, but as born by a fleshly covenant, otherwise it would import no allegory, contrary to the Apostles speech, ver. 24. *which tells us these things are an allegory.* If I should take it in one part of the proposition, in one sense, and in another part of the proposition, in another sense I should then quite spoile the agreement, which I am told must be in it, and then *I* might have been indeed argued against for an absurdity whereas it is said that the *Apostle considers persons borne after the flesh, not as born by humane members and seed, but as borne by a fleshly Covenant*, *I* say, that, that is false, as to the history, and *I* have shewed by reasons that have yet no satisfying answer that the Apostle, *v.* 22, 23. lays down the history, which afterwards he allegorizes in five verses, and then makes application of the history, and not of the allegory, *v.* 29.

3. *That to be* [*born after the flesh*] *should import, birth of* Abraham, *as a beleever, and so natural generation, of each child of a beleever in that respect, but then* [*to be borne after the flesh*] *would be common to* Isaac *with* Ishmael, *to him that is borne after the spirit, of the free woman by promise, with him that is borne after the flesh of the the bond-woman; for to be borne of* Abraham, *or a beleever agrees also to* Isaac, *to him that is born after the Spirit, of the free-woman by promise; whereas to be borne after the flesh is taken in a sense from which* Isaac *and we, that is,* Paul *and other Christian beleevers are excluded.* That is, that certain clear truth by way of necessary corollary would follow, which that great Doctor *Abbot*, in the place quoted takes for granted, speaking of both births, and applying his *tantummodo* twice over to *Ishmaels* birth, he clearly signifies, that *Ishmael* had this honour, and that *Isaac* had it likewise, and that which is far more noble together with it.

4. It is said, *that I quite pervert the Apostles intent, in taking* [*to be born after the flesh*] *to impart an honour, whereas the Apostle mentions, birth after the flesh, as a debasement, takes it in the worser part, not as importing a descent from the father, but from the mother and that mother a bond woman, and therefore the children, servants, or bond-slaves, by reason of their being borne after the flesh.* And doth not the Apostle tell us, in the relation of the history, of their father as well as their mother? does he not speak of one common father, in these words, *Abraham had two sons*, as well as of two different

ferent mothers? and *I* dare not take the boldneſſe to exclude either. *I* confeſſe the Apoſtle mentions [birth after the fleſh] as a debaſement, in putting it in oppoſition to [birth of the Spirit,] yet *I* affirme, that he mentions it alſo, as an honour. As circumciſion was a debaſement in one reſpect, *Eph.*2.11, and an honour in another, *Rom.* 3.1. *Phil.* 3.5. *It* was an honour to have Circumciſion in the fleſh, they were thereby a people of God in Covenant, but it was a debaſement, being put in oppoſition to circumciſſion in heart; and to the worſhipping of God in Spirit and in Truth; it was an honour to be born of *Abraham*, after the fleſh, and frequently mentioned in Scripture as an honour, but an abaſement, when it is oppoſed to the birth of God by the Spirit Much more might be animadverted, but this is enough (as *I* think) to the cauſe, and *I* purpoſely avoid all that concernes the perſon, *I* know not what more may be ſaid, but *I* finde nothing, as yet, ſaid, but that which inſtead of evincing the contrary (being thoroughly examined) is a more full confirmation, that in New Teſtament-times, ſuch a diſtinction of births, is in New Teſtament-times continued, clearly hinted and taken for granted here, and in other Scriptures fully expreſt.

CHAP.

CHAP. LIII.

Matth. 19.14. Mark. 10.14. Luk. 18.16. *Vindicated.*

THat Text in the Goſpel (uttered by our Saviour Chriſt) and recorded by three Evangeliſts, comes now to be conſidered; *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of ſuch is the Kingdome of God.* In the whole Narrative in Goſpel-records we may ſee

The whole narrative analyſed.

First, The pious care of Parents, or others in their ſtead; to preſent Infants to Chriſt.

Secondly, The harſh entertainment that they found from the Diſciples of Chriſt.

Thirdly, The good will of the Lord Chriſt towards them manifeſted.

1. In his diſpleaſure againſt thoſe that forbadé their coming.
2. In his free admiſſion of them.
3. In gratifying their requeſts that brought them.
4. In receiving them in his Armes.

In the words that we have in hand, we ſee. 1. Their admiſſion; or at leaſt charge given for it; *Suffer little children to come unto me.* 2. The reaſon, *for of ſuch is the Kingdome of God.* Here is wont to be enquired. 1. What moved theſe thus to preſent their children. This by the Evangeliſts is expreſſed; *that Chriſt would put his hands upon them, and pray.* Which as they requeſted, ſo he condeſcended to anſwer, *He put his hands upon them, and bleſſed them.* They looked upon Chriſt (as it ſeemes) as a great Prophet highly in favour with God, and ſuch were wont to bleſs in the name of God, and their bleſſing was highly prized. Hands were uſed to be impoſed as in ſacrifices, *Exod.* 29.10. ſo on perſons in bleſſing, *Gen.* 48 14. The reaſon that moved his Diſciples to forbid their coming, can ſcarce be doubted. They ſaw men reſorting to Chriſt; either moved by his Doctrine, or his Miracles, either to be inſtructed, or cured; neither of theſe could be in their thoughts that preſented theſe little ones. They were uncapable of his teaching, being infants; and that they needed not his cure, being not diſeaſed, and therefore they rebuked

Upon what account theſe infants were tendered to Chriſt.

Why they were forbidden by the Diſciples.

Positions tending to clear Christs admission of them.

those that came to tender them. Now to come to a clear understanding of the words, we shall lay first some positions concerning these Infants admission, and afterwards come to the consideration of the reason.

First, *That these were Infants, or as Infants in an incapacity to learne ought from Christ, and so actually to imbrace Christ, or enter Covenant themselves with him.* Which does appear. 1. In that they are called little ones, βρέφη. 2. They were brought, and came not on their own accord. 3. In that Christ took them up in his armes. 4. Had they been capable by age of instruction, with what colour could any have denied them? Why might not they come as well as those multitudes that flocked to him? 5. Why were not the children themselves spoke to, to forbear to come, rather than those that brought them, not to bring them? If they were capable of instruction, they were capable of rebuke. 6. Why is there no word of instruction spoken to them? The young man that came to Christ, was instructed by Christ in the same Chapter. So should these have been instructed as well as blest, had they been in a capacity for instruction.

Secondly, *As they were in an incapacity by reason of age to be taught, so they were not (as was said) diseased to have need of cure.* This the Disciples well knew that this was usual with Christ to cure those that laboured under infirmities of all ages, and therefore would never have had it in their thoughts to have rebuked those that brought these, and the Evangelist would never have concealed this reason, and mentioned another. Such a thing as this I said was vented in a Manuscript, but I knew not that ever any print had maintained it. Now I am told that there is a book in Folio entituled *Baby Baptisme* meere Babisme, that doth assert it. If any man will trouble himself with the book or reasons, he may enjoy his liberty. He sayes the touch mentioned was in order to healing, but I shall rather believe the Evangelist that referres it to blessing, *Mark* 10.16.

Thirdly, *These were infants of such parents, that were in covenant with God, as appeares, in that Christ* who now was in the Coasts of *Judea*, was sent alone to them of *Judea* in covenant with God, *Matth.* 15.24. And was a Minister of the circumcision, *Rom.* 15. And we see how facile he was to them, when his carriage was otherwise, and of another sort: when a Canaanitish

naanitiſh woman comes for her child, *Mat.*15.26. This further appeares by that which they requeſted for theſe infants. This ſeemes to be yielded, *They came* (ſaith one) *to Chriſt upon the conceit that he was a Prophet, and ſo they might bring children to him to be bleſſed*; and furthet ſayes, if this reaſon prove any thing, it is, that the childrens parents were Jewes, which is all that we contend for, the Jewes as yet were in Covenant with God. To this is ſaid, *if it be meant of all the Jewes, and of the covenant of grace in Chriſt, it is palpably falſe, contradictory to the Apoſtles determination*, Rom. 9.7, 8. *I* am ſure, *Rom*, 9.3,4. Proves it to be above all contradiction true, and that *Rom.*9.7,8. hath nothing againſt it, I have largely ſhewed, which is paſt by in ſilence.

Fourthly, *Theſe infants themſelves were in covenant, and ſtood in relation to Chriſt, bearing his name, and being of his people; and were not as heathens in their preſent ſtate without Chriſt; aliens from the Common-Wealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the covenant of promiſe.* This is evident by their free admiſſion by Chriſt, and the reaſon by him given, *of ſuch is the Kingdome of heaven.* After ſome perſonal reflections which *I* am reſolved to wave, *I* am told of the often complaint of the uſe of the word covenant, in ſo various ſenſes, or rather ſometimes none-ſenſe by the *Pædobaptiſts*, and again of their non-ſenſe or proper gibberiſh, which language *I* reſolve to bear, being the leaſt of many thouſands that herein *I* ſuffer.

Fifthly, *They were admitted upon a common right equally belonging to all infants of covenanting parents, and not by vertue of any extraordinary priviledge peculiar to them, and not common to others.* This is plaine. 1. By the general admiſſion which he gives to infants on this occaſion; *ſuffer little children to come unto me*, and *extraordinarium non facit regulam communem*; Here is a general rule, all have admiſſion, and therefore there is nothing extraordinary it is objected, *theſe preſent infants onely were admitted*, but though one ſay it, me thinks another ſhould not be found to beleeve it, of ſuch little ones is the Kingdome of heaven, therefore let theſe little ones come, and onely theſe. 2. *It* was ſuch a right that the Diſciples of Chriſt ought to have underſtood, as plainly appeares by Chriſts ſore diſpleaſure conceived againſt them, for forbidding their admiſſion to him, and

that must be a known right and not secret; One indeed sayes, *They were not admitted out of any known right common to others, but a peculiar priviledge as being elected*; for which *Piscator* is quoted, when as *Piscator* sylogistically concludes the contrary. His evasion of this argument is very well worthy of animadversion, *The reason of Christs anger was their hindring him in his designe, not the knowledge they had of their present visible title, this is but a dream*, afterwards he saith, *the truth is, this thing was done to these infants, not by reason of any visible title they had, or to enter them into any outward Church priviledge, but to accomplish by his blessing their interest in the invisible Kingdom of God by election.* I would demand whether the Disciples did understand Christs designe, or whether they were bound to know it, or were their sinne not to know it; whether they knew these infants to be elect, or whether they were bound to know their election? Neither of these having any ground (election being of the secrets of heaven, and Christ had not made known any such designe) Christ who condemnes anger without a cause as a breach of the sixth commandment, *Mat.* 5.22. would not himself have been angry, where there could be no sin the alone just ground of anger. It is now confest that the Disciples of Christ ought to have understood that they were to be admitted; but it was, *either because they heeded not some particular intimation of his mind concerning those infants, or some general truth concerning Christs office, and his readinesse to do good to all sorts of persons, as there was opportunity offered, from which he ought not to be hindred by them*, when Christ himself assigns an open known reason, of such little ones is the Kingdome of heaven, they that will may heed opposite conjectural reasons. It is confest that elect infants might be baptized were they known; but in this case Christ may be as sore displeased at mens non-baptizing elect ones, as he was at his Disciples for forbidding the admission of these little ones. And let them take heed upon this account lest they suffer more from Christs displeasure in not admitting elect infants to Baptisme, than they can imagine that we shall suffer in the Baptisme of those that are not elected. I am told that I have *just cause to fear the displeasure of Christ for admitting to Baptisme those that are neither known to be elect, nor beleevers, but infants of parents, who are manifestly children of the devil, covenant breakers.* If they

be

be covenant-breakers as is here confeſt, then they are covenanters, for none out of covenant breakes covenant; and *I* here profeſſe that *I* will baptize none of whom *I* have not all aſſurance that they are the children of God. As to that Adoption which is to the inheritance of priviledges, as thoſe were, *Ezek.* 16.20.

Sixthly, *They are here admitted by our Saviour Chriſt to a Church-priviledge, proper to Church-members, the Iſrael of God;* They are admitted to a bleſſing, *Mar.* 10.16. Bleſſing is a Church-priviledge, *Num.*6.22 23,&c. to the end of the Chapter, *The Lord ſpake unto Moſes ſaying, ſpeak unto Aaron and his ſonnes, ſaying, on this wiſe ye ſhall bleſſe the children of Iſrael, ſaying unto them, the Lord bleſſe thee and keep thee,* &c. *And they ſhall put my Name upon the children of Iſrael, and I will bleſſe them.* They are therefore admitted to a Church-priviledge; the *Iſrael* of God are under the bleſſing, little ones are ordered to recieve this bleſſing, little ones therefore are of *Iſrael.* The Lords portion is his people, *Jacob* is the lot of his inheritance, *Deut.*32.9, Theſe are the bleſſed of the Lord upon this account, *Jerem.* 31.23. *As yet they ſhall uſe this ſpeech in the land of Judah, and in the Cities thereof, when I ſhall bring again their captivity; The Lord bleſſe thee O habitation of juſtice, and mountain of holineſſe.* Children are within this number, they are the heritage of the Lord, *Pſalm.*127.3. and conſequently admitted by our Saviour Chriſt to this priviledge of a bleſſing. The Authour that charges non-ſenſe and gibberiſh on Pædobaptiſts in general, there tells his Reader, that my arguing is as though my wits went on wool-gathering, becauſe *I* was not mindful to put my argument into an explicite ſylogiſtical form, but now it is done for his ſatisfaction; bleſſing is a priviledge of the *Iſrael* of God, *Numb.* 6. 23.27. Chriſt admits infants to a bleſſing. Therefore he admits them to a priviledge of the *Iſrael* of God or Church-priviledge. It is objected that Chriſt admits onely a few, but it is with a reaſon that gives admiſſion to others of ſuch is the Kingdome of heaven. A great triumph is made of a ſpeech of mine, *page* 91. of my anſwer, where I ſay we do not think that this bleſſing was baptiſing, or that theſe deſired, or that Chriſt intended their baptiſme; onely we affirme that a *medium* hence may be taken, from whence we may inferre the right of infants

to baptiſme; They that are admitted to one Church-priviledg, may not be denyed another, whereof they are equally capable; But infants are here admitted and order taken for their admiſſion to one Church-priviledge, of which they are no otherwiſe capable than of Baptiſme; ſo that here is no direct precedent for bapriſme in particular, but for Church-priviledges of which infants are capable. None that are intereſſed in the Church of Chriſt which is his Kingdome may be denied an admiſſion to it by Baptiſme. A ground it is, not immediate expreſſe, but by neceſſary conſequence. Obſervation is made, *Mark this ſpeech, if* [*but*] *be adverſative, then he grants that infants are capable of Church-priviledges; not of Baptiſme, which overthrowes all his diſpute.* But that is left out which would fully explaine my meaning, and wholly take off the force of his reply. This act of Chriſt is no direct precedent for Baptiſme in particular, but of Church-priviledges in general. If he can but aſſume and make good with our *Socinian Antibaptiſts* (who in the parts where I live, begin to triumph over *Antipædobaptiſts*, beating them down with their own weapons) that Baptiſme is no Church-priviledge; then *I* ſhall confeſſe, that he hath wreſted this argument out of my hands, and that this text as to this argument falls, otherwiſe it is of force and an undeniable conſequence. I am now told, that, *if this act of Chriſts be a direct precept* (I intended precedent) *of Church-priviledges in general; then it is of Baptiſme in particular, being a Church-priviledge, that which is ſaid of the Genus, being true* (*as Logicians ſay*) *of the* ſpecies, quicquid prædicatur de genere, prædicatur de ſpecie. *Whence it followes, he ſpeaks inconſiſtencies.* But he ſhould have taken in all my words [immediate expreſſe] as well as [direct] and *I* think he that ſpeakes of the *Genus* doth not immediately, directly, and expreſly ſpeak of the *ſpecies*. But if it be otherwiſe, and that herein I was miſtaken, I am here content to retract it, and confeſſe now, with help of this new light, that there is an expreſſe, immediate, direct precedent for infant-Baptiſme.

Concerning the reaſon given of admiſſion of infants in that propoſition of Chriſts, *Of ſuch is the Kingdome of heaven*: We have 1. The ſubject, *of ſuch*. 2. The predicate or attribute, *is the Kingdome of Heaven*. The particle *ſuch* cannot here have reference

reference to their qualification: that those that were qualified as these, in humility, and meekneſſe, had their intereſt; Sheep and Doves as well as infants, are thus qualified. They are not proud, nor revengeful. That which the Diſciples took to be an impediment of force to hinder infants, and a juſt ground of rebuke of thoſe that brought them, is that which Chriſt underſtands in this reproof of the Diſciples, and admiſſion of their infants; But it was their want of growth, their littleneſſe, which the Diſciples took to be a juſt impediment, and which occaſioned their reproof: So that the particle [*ſuch*] hath direct reference to the quantity (as I may ſay) not to the quality of theſe infants, to their infant-ſtature, or minority not to their meekneſſe or humility. And ſo it is referred elſe-where expreſſely by our Saviour himſelf; *Who ſo ſhall receive one ſuch little child*, Matth. 18.5. the word is the ſame here, and there, it reſpects littleneſſe therefore, and not meekneſſe. The whole Text may be thus fitly parathraſed; Trouble not our Maſter with ſuch as theſe, ſay the Diſciples, there is no uſe of their coming, they need not his cure, and they are not capable of his inſtruction, they have no infirmity to be healed, no capacity to be taught; It is fit for men of abler parts, not for infants to make their addreſſe to him, *Let them come*, ſaith our Saviour, *and let not their infant-age exclude them, how little ſoever they are capable of the Kingdome of Heaven.*

For the predicate or attribute, *the Kingdome of heaven*: This as is ſaid, is meant of the Kingdome of Glory; and on this hinge (as is further ſaid) the anſwer to the whole Argument turnes. The Author therefore aſſumes his affirmation, and ſaith; *I determine the Kingdome of Heaven to be meant of the Kingdome of Glory*, and gives his reaſons. To encounter with this confident aſſault of his, I ſhall undertake theſe three particulars.

1. To make it appear that the hinge of the whole hangs not here.

2. That in his reaſons given are nothing ſatisfactory, to evince that it muſt be meant of the Kingdome of Glory.

3. That in caſe it were granted him, yet it doth not at all advantage the leaſe.

First,

First, That all hangs not on this, appeares, in that our Saviour had ſaid enough in his order for admiſſion of theſe infants, on which we can build our concluſion. Thoſe that are admitted to Church-priviledges, they are Church-members; But infants are admitted by our Saviour Chriſt to *C*hurch-priviledges, and therfore are *C*hurch-members. However Maſter *Tombes* can interpret the reaſon, yet he cannot deny *C*hriſts order for their admiſſion, nor deny that it was a *C*hurch-priviledge to which they are admitted. To illuſtrate it by a parallel. The Apoſtle ſayes, 1 *Cor.* 11.10. *The woman ought to have power on her head, becauſe of the Angels.* The womans duty is there cleare, to be covered in token of ſubjection, though we do not agree what is meant by Angels; Whether Angels of Glory, or Gods Miniſters in the Congregations that are called Angels of Churches; our duty is as plain to give infants admittance as Church-members, though the reaſon annext remaines controverted; Whether Gods Kingdome on Earth, or the Kingdome in Glory be here meant by the Kingdome of Heaven.

Secondly, For his Reaſons (which though I ſhould yield, the cauſe is already gained) there is not force in them.

1. *S*aith he, *The Kingdome of God muſt be underſtood,* Mark 10. 14. *as it is* verſ. 15. *and* Luke 18.16. *as* verſ. 17. *and* Matth. 19. 14. *as it is in both thoſe; This is proved, becauſe our Saviour from their eſtate, inferres a likeneſſe to them in others for the ſame eſtate,* Apolog. p. 150. This Argument what colour ſoever it carries, yet it is not concluſive. It may be taken more largely in Chriſts argumentation, and in a more reſtrained ſenſe in his words of Inſtruction or Application, as in a place much parallel I ſhall ſhew, 1 *Cor.* 6.1,2. There we have the Apoſtles reproof, *verſ.* 1. and his reaſon, *verſ.* 2. as in the Evangeliſts we have *C*hriſts aſſertion confirming his reproof, *ver.* 14. and his application, *ver.* 15. Now Saint, in the Apoſtles reproof is taken more largly, than it is taken in his reaſon. A viſible Saint is meant in the firſt place, a real and glorified Saint in the ſecond; viſible Saints may judge in ſmall matters, for real Saints in glory ſhall judge the world, ſhall judge Angels; and ſo it may be here, infants have their preſent title to the viſible Kingdome; and men qualified as infants, ſhall only enter the Kingdome of Glory. His ſecond reaſon, that Chriſt directs his ſpeech to the Diſciples

ciples already in the visible Church, and therefore speaks not of the Church visible, I know not how to make up into a reason; If I understood it, I would either yield or answer it. The third reason, that the speech, *Mark* 10.15. *Luke* 18.17. is like *Mat.* 18.3,4. but there it is meant of the Kingdome of Glory; *Ergo*, so here is answered already. If *Mark* 10.15. *Luke* 18.17. be like *Matth.* 18.3,4. yet *Mark* 10.14. *Luke* 18.16. which we have in question; is unlike to *Matth.* 18 3,4.

Thirdly, Were it granted him, that the Kingdome of Glory must be understood both in Christs reason and application, yet he is nothing holpen. Infants have right to the Church visible militant, because they are in a capacity of entrance into the Church triumphant, *Acts* 2.47. *The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved*; Not necessarily saved, but now (having entered Covenant with God) they were in a capacity, and therefore added as visible Church-members. Infants standing in this capacity, ought to have admission likewise. It is said, *that if this proposition were granted, that they have right to the Church visible militant who shall be of the Church triumphant, yet this right cannot be claimed but by those who are elect, and therefore from these Scriptures so expounded, it cannot be proved that any other than elect infants are to be baptized.*

Answ. If election or non-election must steere us in admission to Baptisme this were to purpose interposed, but when there is nothing that can be objected against them as hindring their salvation it is sufficiently proved that it may not hinder their Baptisme. That must not be pleaded against any as a barre to hinder their admission into the Church on earth that will not hinder their admissiion into the Church in heaven.

CHAP. LIV.

Reasons evincing the Birth-priviledge and Covenant-holinesse of the issue of Beleevers.

HAving already so largely insisted upon by Scripture-proofs, that children are in covenant with parents, and that priviledges of Ordinances (which necessarily imply a covenant) do

descend to posterity, *I* shall lay down certain grounds; some of them making way towards, and others necessarily inferring of themselves the conclusion.

Covenant-interest is of the nature of those things that descend from parent to child.

First, This is of the nature of those things which descend from Parent to childe, from Ancestors to Posterity, which is in their power to convey to their issue. There are those things indeed which are personally inherent in men, and proper to them, so that they cannot convey them to their issue; there is no deriving of them to others by succession. As, 1. Individual accidents of the body, wounds, scarres, or comelinesse of feature, these are so in the Parent, that they are not conveyed to their children. 2. Habits, or proper gifts; whether acquired by pains, or infused. The son of a learned man inherits not his fathers gifts; The son of an Artificer is no such Artist; The son of a Prophet hath not by vertue of birth the gift of prophecy; nor is the son of a regenerate man endowed with saving grace for that reason.

There are on the contrary those things that passe from Parent to childe, which the Parent by nature or special priviledge hath power to convey. As, 1. The essential or integral part of a *Species*, with the natural properties that do accompany it; so one brute beast brings forth another, one brid brings for another, and man brings forth one of mankind. 2. The priviledges or burdens, which in Family or Nation are hereditary, they are conveyed from Parents to Posterity, from Ancestors to their issue; As is the Father, so is the child, as respecting these particulars. This none have questioned, and these things in hand being of the same nature, it is a faire propable ground of it self (if evidence to the contrary from Scripture be not cleare) that they are thus still transmitted.

Like priviledges do descend in Kingdomes, Common-weales, Cities, &c.

Secondly, It is so in Kingdomes, Common-wealths, Cities, in Corporations, Families; The son of a Noble man is Noble, of a Free-man, is Free, *Acts* 22. 28. As the sonne of a bond-man (where by the Law of Nations they are bond men) is a bond-man likewise, *Exod.* 21. 4. Now we know that in Scripture the Church of God is frequently stiled by these names; By the most honourable of them, *Mat.* 8. 11, 12. *Mat.* 21. 43. *Ephes.* 2. 19. *Hebrewes* 12. 22. *Ephesians* 3. 15. to let us understand, that as Cities, Kingdomes, Families, have their

their priviledges; so the people of God in covenant have theirs likewise.

Object.

But we are told, *You do very carnally imagine the Church of God to be like civil Corporations, as if persons were admitted to it by birth; whereas in this all is done by free Election of grace, and according to Gods appointment; nor is God tied, or doth tie himself in the erecting and propagating his Church, to any such carnal respects as descent from men: Christianity is no mans birth-right.*

Sol.

Protestant Divines are taken up by the Jesuites in the self same way for this very thing. *A Lapide* on 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. saith; a *Hence* Calvin *and* Beza *have drawn their opinion of a birth-righteousnesse, and say, that the children of Beleevers are holy, and saved without Baptisme; because on this account that they are Beleevers children, they are reputed to be born in the Church, within that Divine covenant; I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed,* Gen. 17. 7. *As children in the civil Law are accounted free, whose parents are either of them free; but* (saith he) *they are deceived,* and gives his reason; *The Church is not a civil Common-wealth, but supernatural; and there is no man born a Christian, but spiritually new borne, and is made holy; not civilly, but really, by faith, hope and charity infused into the soul.* So *Stapleton* on the same words in his *Antidotum,* (applying the *Spiritual Antidote* against *Calvins Carnal Poyson,*) saith, b *That Jewes carnally descended from* Abraham *or the children of Christians may be made partakers of the Covenant entered of God with* Abraham: *Birth according to the flesh does nothing.* So also *Bellarmine* speaking of the covenant with *Abraham,* saith; c *It descends to us, not by carnal, but spiritual generation;* So that these men have sucked the spiritual meaning from the Jesuites, and Master *Marshal* holds to the carnal imaginations of Protestant Reformers. They produce many Texts of Scripture, where this Birth-priviledge in their thoughts is evidently set forth, Jesuites contrad. it, and upon this account it is a carnal imagination to conceive it.

a *Hinc* Calvinus & Beza *suum dogma de traduce justitiæ hauserunt, docéntque fidelium filios propriè esse sanctos & sine Baptismo salvari quia hoc ipso quo fidelium sunt filii, censentur esse in Ecclesia nati juxta fœdus divinum, Ero Deus tuus & seminis tui,* Ge. 17. 7. *Quemadmodum jure civili censentur liberi qui ex altero parentè libero nascuntur; sed errant.*

b *Fœderis inter Deum &* Abraham *initi participes sint, sive* Judæi *ab eo carnaliter oriundi, sive Christianorum parentum liberi: carnalis generatio nihil facit.*

c *Ad nos descendit non per carnalem generationem parentum, sed per spiritualem regenerationem Christi.*

Object. *The Apostle knew not* (saith one) *that God had so by promise, or other engagement bound himself; but he was free as he said to* Moses *after the promise made to* Abraham, *to have mercy on whom he would*, Rom. 9.15.

Sol. If this be meant of any engagement of God to confer saving graces, or habitual qualifications on the natural seed of Beleevers, the words then carry reason with them. But neither he nor his great friends will learn to distinguish between Gods conditional covenant (contained in priviledges of Ordinances) and habitual saving graces, otherwise they know from *Moses*, that God exercised this freedome in making choise of *Israel* above all Nations, and that the Apostle knew, and in the same Chapter lets us know, *Rom.* 9.4. that to them pertained the covenants, and that this was their prerogative for Birth-priviledge, *Rom.* 3.1. We say the son of a Free-man is Free, the son of a Noble-man is Noble; we never said that the son of a Learned-man is Learned; we say that the son of a Christian is a Christian, as to interest in Ordinances; We never said that the son of a Regenerate man is Regenerate.

Object. It is further urged, *If this were true that the covenant of Grace is a birth-right-priviledge, then the children of Beleevers are children of Grace by nature; for that which is a birth-right-priviledge, is a priviledge by nature. And if Christianity is hereditary, that as the child of a Nobleman is Noble, the child of a Free-man is Free, the child of a Turk is a Turk, of a Jew a Jew, the child of a Christian is a Christian, Then Christians are born Christians, and not made Christians, and how are they then children of wrath by nature; which whether it may not advantage the* Pelagians, *and deniers of Original sinne; it concernes those that use such speeches to consider.*

Sol. To this I answer. It concernes those that presse these objections, to see how *Chamier*, *Paræus* and other Protestant Writers answer them, when they are in their very words urged by Jesuites. If they can reconcile *Galat.* 2.15. with *Ephes.* 2.3. then they have an answer. The Apostle was by birth of the people of God in covenant, and yet by nature a childe of wrath.

Object. It is further said, *To conceive that it is in Gods Churches as in other Kingdomes, and after the Lawes of Nations, is a seminary of dangerous superstitions and errours.*

Sol. It is well that they have learned an Artifice from these super-

superstition-hating Jesuites, to keep out the inlet of superstition among us: if there were no parallel held betwixt the Church of God and other Kingdomes, after the manner of the Law of Nations, but such that are *Seminaries* of superstition; they may do well to acquaint us how it comes to passe, that the Church in Scripture hath the name of a City, Family, Kingdome? Similitudes ever carry some resemblance. If this were the alone ground, on which the Birth-priviledge of Christians were bottomed, they had said something; but being only an illustration of it, and nothing more, they are over lavish in their censure. Similitudes indeed may be over-stretched beyond their reach, and if they had laid down rules to declare where the Similitude holds, and where it holds not (as I have done in the Birth-priviledge) and made it appear that it holds not in that for which I produce it, they had said somewhat to the purpose; Read *Mal.* 1.6,8,14. and tell me whether there be any ground laid for dangerous superstitions.

Birth-interest descends in all other Religions

Thirdly, It is so in all other Religions, they keep up their priviledge of interest in the worship of their Ancestors. The childe of a Turke is a Turke, the childe of a Pagan is a Pagan, the child of a Jew is a Jew: And it is the Apostles Argument in like case respective to Ecclesiastical communion, that because Sacramental communion rendered them one Ecclesiastical body with Christians; so communion in worship will make one body with those of other Religions, 1 *Cor.* 10. 17, 18, 19. See *Paraus* on the words, and *Cudworths* True notion of the Lords Supper. There are common principles that are the same in all Religions, and we must beleeve them to hold, unlesse Scripture hold forth a difference.

God ownes childreu borne in the Church as his servants, and as his children.

Fourthly, God ownes children born in the Church as by birth his, his servants, *Levit.* 25. 39, 40, 41, 42. *If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant, but as an hired servant, and as a sojourner he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubile. And then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him; and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he returne; For they are my servants.* Root and Branch, Parent and childe are servants of God; As they were the servants of their Master; when they could do them

actually no service, by reason of their relation to them; so they are the servants of God on the same account. And as he owns them as his servants, so also he ownes them as by birth his children, Ezek. 16. 20,21. *Moreover, thou hast taken thy sonnes and thy daughters, whom thou hast borne unto me, and these hast thou sacrificed unto them to be devoured; Is this of thy Whoredomes a small matter, That thou hast slain my children, and delivered them to cause them to passe through the fire for them?* If there were no Birth-priviledge, how had God this property in Infants? and this *David* pleads, *Ps.* 116. 16. *O Lord, I am thy servant, truly I am thy servant, and the son of thy hand-maid*; because he was borne in Gods house, and was a childe of a servant of his; he pleads his interest.

Parent and childe respective to Church-interest, are not in an opposite condition.

Fifthly, If the child be not in covenant, the parent and childe are heterogeneal, and respective to Church-relation in the most opposite condition: the Parent in the Kingdom of God by vertue of the faith that he professes: the childe in the Kingdome of Satan by reason of his non-interest in the Promise, and want of title to Covenant-relation. But Scripture makes them still as one, Jewes children are Jewes by nature, Gentiles children are sinners, that is, Gentiles by nature. The Root being holy, the Branches are holy; Parents not sanctified, children are unclean; but Parents being sanctified, they are holy.

No president in Scripture, of a believing Parent bringing up a childe for covenant and not in covenant.

Sixthly, If children be not taken into Covenant with their parents, then the most godly of Parents bring up children; not in covenant, but for a covenant; not in any present interest of relation to God, but at best in an hopeful expectation of it. They bring not forth children to God, but at best they have their desires to traine them for such a future visible relation; But there is no such example in all Scripture of a parent in covenant, training up the seed of their bodies for a covenant. No one in all New Testament-Scripture, ever bred up a childe in yeares to baptize him, no more than in Old Testament-Scriptures they bred their children to circumcise them; we read of many baptized in years, but we read of none borne of Christian parents, kept till yeares of discretion to be baptized.——

Infants out of covenant according to Scripture-

Seventhly, If children be not received into covenant with their parents, but stand without covenant, and in no right of Church-membership, then they are without any Scripture-ground

of

of hope of ſalvation, then they are as all others that are out of covenant; *without Chriſt, without God, without hope.* And becauſe ſome have riſen up againſt this Argument with high clamours, though hitherto with feeble, or rather no reaſons, I ſhall ſomewhat more enlarge my ſelf in confirmation of it. That which the prime authours of, and chiefeſt ſticklers for, the non-federation of infants freely confeſſe, which the general conſent of their adverſaries (Proteſtant Writers) unanimouſly upon Scripture grounds conclude, that the preſent Patrons can maintain with nothing but clamours, and ſuch reaſons (improved to the higheſt) which will equally conclude the hopes of the greateſt Drunkards, Idolaters, Adulterers, Heathens; that muſt be taken for an Argument of force, and a reaſon concluſive this cannot be denyed; But ſo it is here, as I ſhall make good in ſeveral particulars.

grounds are without hope of ſalvation.

1. Thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, that have ſtood up againſt Infants covenant-holineſſe, do confeſſe that all infants going out of the world as they came into the world, in that eſtate periſh, and ſo have provided a chamber in hell, which they call by the name of *Limbus Infantum*, and now ſince their *Limbus Patrum* by Chriſts death is made empty by the fetching out all that were there in expectation of him, and the number of infants thus dying increaſing, it is ſaid by ſome that theſe two are laid together: howſoever it falls out with theſe places about which we have no reaſon to buſie our ſelves, this poſition that infants thus dying without any covenant, or Church-intereſt, do periſh, followes as directly from their principles as any concluſion from its premiſes.

Jeſuites our leading adverſaries confeſſe it.

2. Proteſtant Divines who aſſert Infant-ſalvation, and beleeve no ſuch diviſion of hell into chambers, and have other thoughts of the condition of Infants, ſtill bring this intereſt of theirs in the covenant of God as their ground, (not prying into the ſecrets of Election, nor urging prerogative above that which is written) the covenant of God, *Gen.* 17. 7. confirmed by the New Teſtament-Scriptures before mentioned. They very well know, that in caſe Papiſts can wreſt this covenant-intereſt of infants from them, they conclude according to Scripture-ground their damnation: *Luke* tells us, there were daily added to the Church ſuch as ſhould be ſaved, namely to the Church viſible, as

Proteſtant Divines cannot avoid it.

as the Text is clear, *Acts* 2.47. Now if they ſtand not admitible into the Church, they ſtand without hope of ſalvation; ſee how the Apoſtle joynes theſe together, *Epheſ.* 2.12. *Without Chriſt, being aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the Covenants of Promiſe. having no hope, and without God in the world.* If any can conclude againſt the intereſt of any in the Common-wealth of *Iſrael,* that is, the Church of God, and the covenants of promiſe (which thoſe do that will have them to be no Church-members, nor to be taken into covenant with Parents) they ſadly doome them to be *without Chriſt, without God, without Hope.* Thoſe that diſclaime *Zuinglius* his opinion, that *Hercules, Socrates, Ariſtides, Numa*, and ſuch like Heathens are now in heaven; would be deſired to ſhew how they caſt thoſe out, upon that account as Heathens, and take in infants as great ſtrangers (according to them) to any Church-intereſt. Infants want not ſin for condemnation; our firſt Original eſtate being a corrupt eſtate, and by nature children of wrath, and putting them out of covenant, they can finde no Scripture-way to entitle them to Chriſt for redemption; They ſeeme to conceive other hopes of the ſalvation of infants of Heathens, that upon the ſame ground they may be charitable to the infants of Chriſtians, that with them are in the ſame poſture with Heathens, when they ſpeak of *Hercules* and other Heathens as before; yet ſpeaking of the infants of Heathens, they ſay, *It is bad to ſay, that God doth not ſave ſome of the infants of Indians* pro beneplacito, *according to his good pleaſure.* For any warrant we can finde in Scripture, it is as bad to ſay it of the parent as of the childe. The Scriptures leave the whole of the Family, root and branch under the fury and wrath of God, *Jeremiah* 10. 25. *Pſal.* 79.6.

Our preſent adverſaries inſtead of reaſons oppoſe onely comers againſt it.

3. The preſent Patrons of this non-federation of infants, can maintaine their ſalvation with nothing but clamours, and ſuch reaſons improved to the higheſt, that equally conclude the ſalvation of the greateſt drunkards, adulterers, idolaters, Heathens; I ſhall now purpoſely for peace ſake paſſe by thoſe high clamors and bitter invectives that we meet with on this occaſion, and come to take notice of the reaſons produced, to exempt infants from this doom of condemnation, and all that I can find is one and the ſame thing to fly for refuge to prerogative; *This*

is

is my judgement (saith one) *that God will have us to suspend our judgment of this matter, and Rest on the Apostles determination,* Rom. 9. 18. For satisfaction of which I need to adde no more than what I have said, *page* 15. of my Answer, seeing it rests, & not one word yet replied to it. The Text of Scripture (which we have over and over) is, *that God will have mercy on whom he will have mercy,* telling his adversary, *that it is bad to say that God doth not save* pro bene placito, which no adversary of his will deny, But God is pleased in his Word to make known the way of the dispensation of his mercy, otherwise the vilest person against whom in our ministerial way, we denounce Gods judgments, may reply that his hope of salvation is as good as the best, for God saves *ex bene placito*, and hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and the best soul, in a case of disertion, will take off all his applications of comfort, with the close of that Scripture, *And whom he will he hardeneth,* Rom. 9.18. And so the Jews even in their rejection, (of which the Apostle speaks so largely,) being cut off by unbelief, might have pleaded their hope of salvation, as well as in a beleeving condition; we must therefore not look to the secret Will of God, of which no reason can be given, but his good pleasure; but into his revealed Will, where he is pleased to make known the dispensation of this will and good pleasure of his, and so we shall learn not to carry our hopes beyond his promise. To that Text of the Apostle, *Eph.* 2. 12. In which all out of Covenant are concluded to be without hope, It is said, *Though the Gentiles were without hope,* Ephes. 2. 12. *in respect of the body of them, yet now and then, God called some, as* Rahab, *out of the visible Church, and therefore we may not determine universally that out of the visible Church there is no salvation at all.* But when *Rahab* was thus called she was no more a Gentile, as appears, *Ephes.* 2. 11. as the Ephesians had been, but in present were no Gentiles, so also it was with her, neither she, nor they, were saved out of the Church; but brought into the Church for salvation.

CHAP. LV.

A Corollary for Infants Baptiſm.

Infant-Baptiſm by Arguments aſſerted.

THen it follows by way of neceſſary Corollary, that Infants have right to Baptiſm, children of baptized parents are entitled to that Ordinance.

Firſt, thoſe that have been Church-members, and admitted with the initiating ſign and ſeal, are yet to be admitted, unleſſe order be given to the contrary; But Infants have been Church-members, and accordingly admitted by the initiating ſign and ſeal, neither is there any order for the contrary; Therefore Infants are Church-members, and ſtill to be admitted.

Secondly, Thoſe that are under the Covenant-promiſes of God with the body of his people, have right to Baptiſm, *Acts* 2. 39. But Infants are under the Covenant-promiſes of God with the body of his people; Infants therefore have right to Baptiſm.

Thirdly, Saints, or holy perſons have right to Baptiſm: Infants are Saints, they are holy perſons, *Rom.* 11.16. 1 *Cor.* 7.14. Infants therefore have right to Baptiſm.

Fourthly, They that by birth according to the fleſh, are in the boſome of the Church, have right to Baptiſm: But Infants by birth according to the fleſh are in the boſome of the Church, *Gal.* 4. 29. Infants therefore ought to be baptized.

Fifthly, They that are admitted to Church-priviledges have right to Baptiſm, the leading priviledge; But Infants are admitted to Church-priviledges, *Mark* 10. 14. *Matth.* 19.14. *Luke* 18.16. Infants therefore have right to Baptiſm.

Sixtly, The children of the Kingdome, that with others make up the Kingdome of God, have right to Baptiſm; But Infants are the children of the Kingdome, that with others make up the Kingdome of God, *Mark* 10. 14. *Matth.* 19.14. *Luke* 18. 16. Infants therefore have right to Baptiſm.

Seventhly, The heritage of the Lord are to be admitted to Baptiſm:

ptiſm: But Infants are the heritage of the Lord, *Pſal.* 127.3. therefore Infants are to be admitted to baptiſm.

Eightly, Thoſe that are to be ſaved, are to be added to the Church by baptiſm, *Acts* 2.47. Infants are to be ſaved, and therefore are to be added to the Church by Baptiſm.

In all of theſe Syllogiſmes the minor is at large confirmed in the diſcourſe before-going, the major in each ſhall preſently be at large confirmed, and ſo the concluſion will be undenyable.

Here it is objected with no ſmall noiſe, that Infant-baptiſme wants an inſtitution, we find no command for it in all New Teſtament-Scripture, where our warrant alone is for New Teſtament-Ordinances. Neither have we any example in the New Teſtament of an Infant baptized; whatſoever then our Arguments are, this concludes it to be without warrant. To ſpeak to theſe, and firſt to the inſtitution.

Objections againſt Infants Baptiſm anſwered.

The inſtitution ſpoken to in this objection, either is an inſtitution of the Ordinance of Baptiſm it ſelf; or elſe an inſtitution with limit to Infant-age; For Baptiſm it ſelf they will not deny that we have warrant in the New Teſtament; *John* was ſent to baptize in the Nation of the Jews, *John* 1.33. and the Apoſtles have their commiſſion, *Matth.* 28.19. *to baptize all Nations.* For an inſtitution with limit to Infant-age; we heard but even now there was no inſtitution in the Old Teſtament for Infant-Circumciſion. The inſtitution *Gen.* 17.10. is for males without limit in reſpect of growth: I am ſure it cannot be affirmed that there is any inſtitution of Baptiſm in the New Teſtament, with limit to any determinate age or growth. This ob ection if it have force in it, followed home, will overthrow all Baptiſm at any age, and every other New Teſtament-Ordinance whatſoever. Suppoſe a man of 20,25,30,40,50. years of age ſeeketh Baptiſm. According to this rule, he muſt bring a preſcript for one of this age to be baptized, and the ſame alſo for the Lords Supper. But it is replied, *Beleevers of any age may be baptized, beleeve, and the age is not regarded.* This will be eaſily yielded, if they be not already baptized, but then the

The Queſtion ſtated whether there be any inſtitution of Infant-Baptiſm.

institution with limit to Infancy is waved; and upon the same account Church-Members in Covenant of any age, ought to be baptized, and so the institution is not in question about that there is an agreement. But whether Infants be in Covenant, or whether they be any Church-Members, is to be disputed, which already is satisfied.

Infants are within the verge of the institution of Baptisme.

2. I say those words of our *Saviour*. *Matth.*28.19. *Disciple all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* do comprize Infants in them as well as men of years; Infants serving to make up a Nation as well as Parents. The Infants of *Nineveh* did make a considerable party of the City of *Nineveh*. The Infants of any Nation make up a part of the Nation, and the Nation where they came was to be discipled, and baptized. And that Infants are here comprehended, farther appears by this Argument.

In the same sense and latitude as Nation was taken in respect of the Covenant of God, when the Covenant and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to that one onely Nation, where their commission was first limited; In the same sense it is to be taken (unless the Text expresse the contrary) now the commission is enlarged. This cannot be denyed of any that will have the Apostles to be able to know Christs meaning, by his words in this enlarged commission: But Nation then (as is confessed) did comprehend all in the Nation in respect of the Covenant, and nothing is expressed in the Text to the contrary; therefore it is to be taken in that latitude to comprehend Infants. This Argument hath strength from that of the Apostle, *Acts* 3. 25. *Yea are the children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto* Abraham, *and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.* As it was with the kindred of *Abraham* in respect of Covenant-holinesse; so it is with all kindreds of the earth, they joyntly make one party in the Covenant. But Infants of *Abrahams* kindred were in the Covenant, and of the Nation, in respect of Covenant-blessednesse.

But it will be said, that *an exception of Infants is implied, in that all of the Nation must be discipled before they be baptized: But Infants are not capable of being discipled; and so they are made uncapable of Baptism.*

I answer. 1. Here is implied that they are of capacity to be Disciples, in that Christ sends to disciple Nations, and they serve to make up the Nation.

2. His

2. It is the way of Scripture-ſpeaking of an univerſality of a people in a Land, expreſſely to except Infants in caſe they be to be excepted, as we ſee in the judgement that befell *Iſrael* in the wilderneſſe, to the cutting off of thoſe that came out of the Land of *Egypt*, *Numb.* 14. 38. And in the Covenant entered by the body of the Nation of all degrees and ſexes at their returne from *Babylon*, *Nehem.* 10. 28. and an exception could be no where more uſeful and neceſſary than there; to let us know that it is otherwiſe with Gentiles in this particular, then it was with the Jewes, that the Nations where their commiſſion thus enlarged, were herein differenced from the Nation to which their Miniſtry was firſt limited.

3. Let that Text of the Prophet be well weighed, where ſpeaking by the Spirit of Prophecy of the rejection of the Jewes, and the glorious call of the Gentiles in their ſtead (in that ample way as it is there ſet out) he hath theſe words: *Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and ſet up my ſtandard to the people, and they ſhall bring thy ſonnes in their armes, and thy daughters ſhall be carried upon their ſhoulders*, Iſa. 49. 22. If there were but ſuch an hint as that, by way of Prophecy, to have left them behinde, we ſhould from ſome, have heard of it with a noiſe.

Infans are Diſciples.

4. In the Lord Chriſts own Dialect, who is beſt able to expreſſe his own meaning, they are Diſciples. To belong to Chriſt is to be a Diſciple of Chriſt. This is plaine from our Saviours own mouth, comparing his words recorded in *Matthew* and in *Mark*, *To give a cup of cold water to drink in the name of a Diſciple*, it is in the one, *Matth.* 10. 42. *To give a cup of water to drinke in my name, becauſe ye belong to me*, it is in the other, *Mark* 9. 41. To belong to Chriſt, to be a Diſciple of Chriſt, and to bear the name of Chriſt is one and the ſame thing with our Saviour. Now that infants are of the number of thoſe who as Diſciples in Chriſts account do belong to him, and bear his name, is yet farther plaine by another Text of Saint *Matthew*, *Matth.* 18. 5. where Chriſt ſetting a little childe in the midſt of his hearers, ſaith, *Whoſo ſhall receive one ſuch little childe in my name, receiveth me*. By all which it appeares, that which is done to Infants, is done to Diſciples, & hath a glorious reward as done to Diſciples. Infants therefore are Diſciples of Chriſt, are of thoſe that do belong unto him, and beare his name: Who then

is not afraid to refuse them who will receive Christ? Who will not baptize them that is willing to baptize Disciples in the name of Christ?

The invalidity of that objection, that we have no example of Infant-Baptisme examined.

For that part of the objection, that there is no example in New Testament-Scripture of infant-Baptisme. I answer.

First, For an example of Baptisme with limit to any one precise number of years, or dayes; we have but one that I know (if that) in Scripture, and that is of Christ, who was (as is computed) about the age of thirty, when he was baptized, if this be presst and followed, all must at that alone be for Baptisme, and no other of any age may be baptized.

Secondly, There are many things of which we make no question, and yet we have no example of them: I have instanced in the trial of the suspected wife by the water of jealousie, that there is no example for it in all the Old Testament-Scripture; and for womens receiving of the Lords Supper, there is not a particular institution, or any particular expresse precedent for it in the New Testament; They cannot give us any instance of any one trained up by believing Parents for Baptisme, and assoon as he could give an account, baptized; not one childe of a Beleever brought up for covenant, and not in covenant. One goes about to give instance of particular precedents for womens receiving the Lords Supper. 2. And instead of a precedent urges, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. as an expresse command in formal termes for women, ἄνθρωπος comprehending both Sexes. To this I have replied in my answer, *pag.* 52. We are then furnished with an expresse command in termes as formal, and with an example to boote of womens circumcision; and so the difference between circumcision and Baptisme (so often laid in the dish of Pædobaptists) here falls to the ground; *Ye on the Sabbath-day do circumcise,* ἄνθρωπον *a man,* John 7. 22. *if* ἄνθρωπος *a man on the Sabbath-day receive circumcision, that the Law of* Moses *should not be broken,* John 7. 23. Here is *Moses* his command, the Jewes practice, with Christs approbation, in the same comprehensive latitude in regard of both Sexes, as in Saint *Paul* for receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. And if arguments borrowed from Grammer use of words, be of that force; you see what they have proved, As ἄνθρωπος is taken in one Sacrament, so it is to be taken in another: But in the Sacrament of circumcision it is limited to the male only,

ly, to which accords that Logick rule; *Omne analogum stans per se, stat pro famosiori analogato.* To this is replyed that the subject matter of the command as well as the Grammar use of the word, proves females to be included, but then his expresse formal command is lost, they are not expresst, but included, and by consequence onely, which will not be denied. He farther sayes, *that* 1 Cor. 10. 17. *is an expresse command in formal termes of womens receiving the Lords Supper; we being many, are one bread, and one body, for we are partakers of one bread.* I demand, whether the Apostle speaks in the person of Christians, or in the person of women? not of women sure, for he takes in himself, and he was a man, and then the formality of an expresse Example falls. He brings *Acts* 20. 7. that *the Disciples on the first day of the week came together to break bread.* Here is an example as expresse and formal, as the former. They cannot infallibly prove by help of consequence, much lesse expressely, that there was a woman there. At that night-meeting there might be none but men, as at the first institution. It can never be an expresse example till it be made to appear that none are Disciples but women.

Thirdly, The examples that we have of a whole household, being baptized; if some had them in hand, would be sufficiently formal; but any thing will serve as an expresse proof, when they have a mind to affirme it, and nothing will serve to evince it by consequence, when they have a mind to deny it. But as Disciples are women, so families have children. There are Families without children, and there are Disciples that are not women. The commission is to disciple Nations, and baptize them. Providence hath happily ordered that Nations have been brought in, and their Infants received to Baptisme. In the Primitive times households were baptized, without mention of exclusion of children, in after-ages households have come in with their children.

Infants want of faith and repentance, no impediments of their Baptisme.

Secondly, It is yet objected, *Men must believe and be baptized,* Mark 16. 16. *Repent and be baptized,* Acts 2. 39. Infants can neither beleeve, nor repent, therefore they may not be baptized; and will it not as directly follow, that when they can neither believe nor repent, they must be damned; let them frame an answer to the one, and then they have answered both; That which will

speak

ſpeak for them to receive them into heaven (notwithſtanding thoſe Scriptures that threaten condemnation to men in unbelief and impenitency,) will ſpeak alſo, to receive them into the Church by Baptiſme.

The want of expreſſe words, Infants ought to be baptized is no impediment of their Baptiſme.

Thirdly, Some ſay, *Where is it ſaid in ſo many words, infants muſt be baptized? Bring us thoſe words, we abhorre ſyllogiſmes and conſequences.* To deale with them with their owne weapons; Where is it ſaid that Infants muſt not be baptized, where are thoſe words written? if they care not for our conſequences, we ſhall not care for theirs. They have anſwered. *Negatives cannot be proved.* To this we anſwer. 1. Where is that ſaid? we finde it no where in Scripture, that *Negatives* cannot be proved. 2. Chriſt proved *Negatives*, That himſelf was not a Spirit; *A Spirit hath not fleſh and bones, as you ſee me have*, Luke 24. 39. That God was not to be tempted, *Mat.* 4. 7. 3. if *Negatives* cannot be proved, then *Negatives* are not to be believed, ours is an *Affirmative* which they yield may be proved, theirs, is a *Negative* which they ſay cannot be proved, we then have the better of it, there is hope of proof on our ſide, theirs is deſperate.

Neceſſity of Scripture conſequence.

To help the Reader in a word for the neceſſity of conſequences: If thoſe be fools that cannot gather conſequences from Scripture, to ſettle their faith upon them, then much more thoſe that deny them; But ſuch are fooles by our Saviours own teſtimony, that cannot gather conſequences from Scripture to ſettle their faith on them, *Luke* 24. 25, 26. *O fools and ſlow of heart to beleeve all that the Prophets have ſpoken, ought not Chriſt to have ſuffered theſe things, and to have entred into his glory?* Thoſe were fools and dullards that did not beleeve from the Scriptures of the Prophets, that Chriſt muſt ſuffer and enter unto glory. But thoſe words are no where in expreſſe words written: It is alone by conſequence from the Prophets words that we know them. Somewhat I have ſpoken to thoſe that reaſon in this ſort, leſt they ſhould be wiſe in their own conceit, I will have no more to deal with them, leſt I be thought to be like them.

Antiquity for Infant-Baptiſme.

Fourthly, There is a great flouriſh made by ſome, as though Antiquity were againſt Infant-Baptiſme, and famous flouriſhing Churches never received it: In which ſome have taken much pains, but never did men travel in a buſineſſe to leſſe purpoſe,

as all may ſee that will take the pains to read what they have wrote, and bring it home to that which lies upon their hand to prove, which is, that Infant-Baptiſme is not ancient, as is pretended, that there were ſome ages of the Church in which it was not in uſe. In all of which ſearch of theirs and help that they have found from the greateſt Antiquaries of the *Socinian* party, no friends to the Baptiſm of infants, they cannot finde one Writer of any kinde whatſoever, or whereſoever, from the day that *John* baptized in *Jordan*, and in *Ænon* near *Salom* to this very year, that hath ſaid, and left on record, *That there was no ſuch cuſtome as Infant-Baptiſm in his dayes*; and when ſo many have expreſſely affirmed that the original, was from the Apoſtles, and that no beginning of it in the Church can be found, till ſome one appear in contradiction to aſſert the non-uſage of it in his time, let any indifferent Reader judge to what purpoſe all ſerves that can be ſaid. The primitive times had not muſical inſtruments in their congregations, they had not Altars, Images, they erected not Temples to Saints, this we hear from Writers in their ſeveral Ages, and in caſe they had not infant-Baptiſm (when the Church of the Jewes had infant-circumciſion, and the ancient, made Baptiſme to ſucceed circumciſion) and never any one mention their non-uſage of it, or give any reaſon concerning it, is above a wonder, the prime argument to render this practice to be of lower ſtanding, than is pretended, is the ſilence of ſome Authors of ancient, who times in their workes (as is ſaid) do not mention it, as *Ignatius*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Athanaſius*, *Epiphanius*, and *Euſebius*, *if it had been known in their times, why do they not once mention it*? To this, much might be ſaid. 1. Every Writer doth not treat of all Subjects, nor deal in all Arguments, ſome have written in our age, and infant-Baptiſm is not found in all their Writings, ſhall after-ages infer upon their ſilence that infant-Baptiſme was not uſed in our times? 2. If ſome Writers do not mention it, yet others in the ſame time, or neer about, ſpeak fully to it. 3. Maſter *Marſhal* full proofs of it, in ſeveral of the Authors that are ſaid to be ſilent in it, as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Athanaſius*, and that in *Epiphanius*, that doth neceſſarily imply it. And thoſe that minde farther ſatisfaction of his Objections, drawn from the Queſtions put to the baptized, and the delay of Baptiſme by ſome, they may finde it in his

Anſwer, and if he ingenuouſly confeſſed, that he craved the help of ſome learned Antiquaries, it ſpeakes but little ingenuity in thoſe that once and again upbraid him for it. I have put to the adverſaries ſeven Queries concerning the practice of antiquity about Infant-Baptiſme, with ſome Obſervations alſo about it, in my Anſwer of his Letter, *page* 3. to the tenth, which I thought might give ſome ſatisfaction to all that which hath been ſpoke to this thing, but have received no anſwer; It is ſaid by one that the determination mentioned by *Cyprian*, ſo farre as he can finde by ſearch, is the ſpring-head of infant-Baptiſme, which upon challenge made, he thus explaines. *I did not deny that I found infant-Baptiſm practiſed before, but that the determination of that Councel was the ſpring-head that is the firſt determined rule or Canon, by force of which, it hath ſince continued in a ſtream, and this is true.* It ſeemes the River had runne ſome hundreds of years before the ſpring-head brake forth, but not in ſuch a channel as a determinate rule or Canon, when it is well known that infant-Baptiſme was not in that Councel of 66 Biſhops at all agitated, much leſſe determined; It was not put to the Queſtion, but taken for granted by all that were preſent. The diſpute and the determination was upon that which *Fidus* queſtioned, which was the Baptiſme of infants before eight dayes old, and not infant-Baptiſme; how could he mean that it hath ſince continued in a ſtreame, by vertue of that determination or Canon, when he very well knowes there was neither determination nor Canon upon it, nor yet any need of it? They determined that which in their meeting was put to the Vote, that an infant under eight dayes might be baptized. So that this Quære, as all the reſt, ſtands unſatisfied, and antiquity cleared for infant-Baptiſme.

Infant Baptiſm is not beſtowed on unwritten tradition.

It is yet farther ſaid, that many learned men in former and latter times, take infant-Baptiſme onely for an unwritten tradition; giving us a liſt of Popiſh Writers that have ſpoke to this purpoſe, *a Cardinal in a Popiſh Councel*, Bennus, Bellarmine *and* Eraſmus *that had ſcarce ſtept over the threſhold from them*: To which we anſwer, That it is no marvel, if theſe making it their buſineſſe to parallel unwritten Traditions with Scriptures, ſome of them to preferre them before them, and knowing infant-Baptiſme to be in honour in all Churches, do pin it upon unwritten Tradition,

Tradition, that ſo they may advance the honour of unwritten Tradition with it, yet even theſe cite Scriptures for it, and ſo marre their own market of Traditions, as thoſe that procure them are forced to acknowledge. When *Bellarmine* would argue the Scriptures imperfection, and aſſert a neceſſity of unwritten Tradition, then he can affirme that infant-Baptiſme, hath no other foundation, but when he will defend infant-Baptiſme againſt thoſe that matter not Tradition, he can finde Scripture for confirmation: Foreſeeing this Objection an Anſwer is brought out of *Bennus*, *That ſome things may be proved out of Scripture, when the true ſenſe of Scripture is evident; and infant-Baptiſme is proved from* John 3. 5. *but the ſenſe whereby to prove it is manifeſt by tradition*, Becan. Manual. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. *ſect.* 24. It is very well known that theſe Jeſuites will ſay as much of any point of Faith, and leave the whole meaning of all Scripture to reſt on the Churches interpretation, continued by tradition. As to the quotation of Proteſtant Authors, ſo many of them as have kept up the honour of Scripture, and made no defection from that way, it onely ſpeakes their boldneſſe to affirme that any of them ever diſhonoured infant-Baptiſme in that way, as to ſettle it upon unwritten tradition, or to fixe it on ſuch a bottome. They very well know, that, as they defend the Scriptures full perfection, and make it their buſineſſe to oppoſe all that would, have it ek't out by any thing that is unwritten, ſo, they aſſert infant-Baptiſme on Scripture-foundation. Can they think that they have to deal with ſuch weak adverſaries, that whiles againſt their party they contend with Scripture-Arguments, that infants ought to be baptized, they will yield up the cauſe on the other hand to Papiſts, and confeſſe the inſufficiency of Scriptures. But the homonymie or various acception of the word Tradition, may deceive the unwary Reader; Sometimes tradition is taken in the proper ſenſe, for that which is delivered, or handed over from one to another, in this ſenſe, every point of faith is a tradition, and ſo is Baptiſm it ſelf, as well as infant-Baptiſme in which ſenſe *Paul* takes it, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 15. *Stand faſt, and hold the traditions, which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epiſtle.* Sometimes tradition is taken for that which is delivered in word, without writing, as there is diſtinguiſhed a tradition by word, and a tradition by Epiſtle; what *Paul* taught in his Epiſtles

The various acception of the word Tradition.

is a tradition, and what *Paul* delivered by word of mouth is a tradition, and both must be held. Here somewhat seemingly is spoken for unwritten traditions by the Apostle. For solution of which our Protestant Divines have taught us to (a) *distinguish between the doctrine it self that is delivered to us, and the way and manner of delivery.* So *Chamier de canone fidei, lib.* 8. *cap.* 1. *sect.* 16. The former of those might admit of many sub-divisions. The way of delivery is either by writing in the Scriptures, or by lively voice by Gods Ministers, as *Chamier* farther observes, *sect.* 19. Here again we must distinguish between words and things, the words that are uttered and the doctrine that these words contain; all words are not written, all our words in Sermons are not written in the Scriptures, all *Pauls* words in his Sermons are not written in Scriptures, as appears by his distinction before delivered, *by word or Epistle*, but the doctrine it self that we deliver is contained there; *Paul* preached *nothing but that which* Moses *and the Prophets said should come*, Acts 26. 22. yet there were many words delivered by him, which *Moses* and the Prophets never spoke; b They yet teach us to distinguish between that which is expressely written in the Scriptures, and that which is by evident consequence thence deduced: *Amesius* defending the Scriptures perfection against *Bellarmine*, introducing unwritten traditions, saith, c *The Question is not whether in so many words all necessary truths are contained in the Scriptures, but whether they may be gathered from thence, in any expresse speech, or necessary consequence?* Bellar. Enervat. *cap.* 6. *thes.* 1. Let Doctor *Sclater* in this be heard, who speaking to this point, saith, *Thus informe your selves,* 1. *Where generals are delivered, there are all particulars comprized in those generals intentionally delivered, because generals comprehend particulars.* 2. *Where principles and causes are delivered, there effects are also intended, as being virtually contained in their principles.* 3. *Where one equal is taught, all of like reason is taught, quia parium par ratio, and where there is par ratio, there is par lex: Where there is like reason, there is like law. So take contents of Scripture, no instance of any point of necessary, or but convenient faith and practice, can be given but what is delivered in the written Word.* Doctor *Sclater* in 2 *Thes.* 2. 15. and when they have well weighed these things they will finde small cause to believe that they have any advantage from these Authors. *Field*

(it

a *Distinguendum inter res, quæ traduntur in Ecclesia & rationem earum tradendarum.*

b *Quædam & sunt & dicuntur in Scripturis, quædam vero sunt in Scripturis tametsi non dicuntur.* Nazianzen. *lib* 5. *de Theol.*

c *Non quæritur an totidem verbis omnia necessaria in Scripturis continentur, sed vel sententia expressa vel per necessariam consequentiam inde colligenda.*

(it is said) *sayes, The fourth kinde of Tradition is the continued practice of such things as are neither contained in the Scripture expresselv, nor the examples of such practice there delivered, though the grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of such practice be there contained, and the benefit or good that followeth it. Of this sort is the Baptisme of infants, which is therefore named a tradition, because it is not expressely delivered in Scripture that the Apostles did baptize infants, nor any expresse precept there found that they should do so, yet is not this so received by bare and naked tradition, but that we finde in Scripture to deliver unto us the grounds of it.* If they will subscribe to that part, *That the grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of infant-Baptisme are contained in Scriptures*, then I will subscribe to the other, that those words, *infants ought to be baptized are not the Scripture.* Then Doctor *Prideaux* is brought in, who sayes, *Pædobaptisme rests on no other divine right then Episcopacy*, but we are not told whether Doctor *Prideaux* goes about to bring down infant-Baptism to unwritten Tradition, or to bring up Episcopacy to divine right according to Scripture. And out of these Premisses this conclusion is inferred, *that the Ancients and learned afore* Zuinglius *did account infant-Baptisme to have been an unwritten tradition, having reason from Scripture not evident of it self, but to be received from the determination of the Church.* Which for ought that I can discerne is thus gathered, some Papists to set up unwritten traditions have, in contradiction to themselves, fastened infant-Baptisme upon it, of which onely one lived before *Zuinglius.* Some Protestant Writers, every one of them living after *Zuinglius* speak not one word to the purpose: *Ergo* the learned before *Zuinglius* did account infant-Baptisme to be an unwritten tradition. Me thinks the Scripture-Arguments which may be found in Authors far above *Zuinglius* his standing, as in *Aquinas* 3. *part. quæst.*68. *art.*9. *August. de Baptis. contra Donat. lib.*4. *cap.*24. with others, might with more strength conclude, that they rested on a written foundation, and were not satisfied with unwritten tradition.

CHAP. LVI.

The reality of connexion, between the Covenant and initial ſeale, aſſerted.

THe ſeveral minor propoſitions, in the ſyllogiſmes before laid down, being proved at large, in the foregoing diſcourſe. So that nothing more needs to be added, yet if there be no neceſſary connexion, between the covenant, and the ſeale, the major propoſitions, will yet be called into queſtion. Though it be granted, that infants be Church-members, are in covenant, have the promiſes, are Saints, are in the boſome of the Church by birth-priviledge, are children of the Kingdome, &c. Yet it will be ſaid (though moſt unreaſonably) that they are not yet to be baptized, I ſhall therefore 1. Bring Scripture proofes for the real connexion between the covenant and the ſeale, clearing thoſe Scriptures from exceptions taken againſt them. 2. I ſhall make it good with arguments or reaſons. 3. I ſhall returne anſwer to objections brought againſt that which is here aſſerted.

That all in covenant, are to enjoy the initial ſeal of the covenant, let the words of God himſelf, in the inſtitution of circumciſion be conſidered, *Gen.* 17. 7, 9, 10, 11, 14. *I will eſtabliſh my covenant, between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations, for an everlaſting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee. Thou ſhalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations: This is my covenant which ye ſhall keep, between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, Every man-child among you ſhall be circumciſed, and ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreskinne, and it ſhall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And the uncircumciſed man-child, whoſe fleſh of his foreskin is not circumciſed, that ſoul ſhall be cut off from his people.* Here we ſee 1. A covenant entered. 2. A ſeal appointed, as the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4. 11. calls it. 3. The neceſſary connexion between the ſeal and covenant declared. They are to be circumciſed, becauſe they are in covenant, Having intereſt in the covenant. They have together with it, intereſt in the initial ſeal, againſt this is objected.

First,

First, *All the force of this proof hangs on the particle* [*therefore,*] verſe 9. *and may be rendered; And thou, or, but thou, as well as, thou therefore, and is by others rendered.* Tu autem, *and* Tu verò, *which are neither of them illative termes.* 1. We have no reaſon but that it may be an illative as well as a copulative, and being an illative particle, he hath no exception againſt the ſtrength of it. 2. I deny, that all the force of the proof hangs on that particle; look farther on into *verſe* 10. *This is my covenant, which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee; every manchilde among you ſhall be circumciſed,* and take in with it *Acts* 7. 8. *And he gave him the covenant of circumciſion; And ſo* Abraham *begat* Iſaac, *and circumciſed him the eighth day, &c.* and let them at more leiſure finde an anſwer to this argument. That which God himſelf calls by the name of a covenant, ought not to be ſeparated from it: But God calls circumciſion by the name of a covenant, *Ergo* they ought not to be ſeparated. 2. Let them conſider the relation in which the Apoſtle puts this Sacrament of circumciſion to the covenant, *Rom.* 4 11. An inſtituted appointed ſigne and ſeale, is not to be divided from that which it ſignifies and ſeales, circumciſion was an inſtituted appointed ſigne and ſeale of the covenant; therefore it is not to be divided from it.

Secondly, it is ſaid, *If it were granted, that* [*therefore*] *is the beſt reading; yet that the inference,* verſe 9. *ſhould be made from the Promiſe only,* verſe 7. *I will be a God to thee and thy ſeed after thee, and not as well, if not rather from the Promiſe,* verſe 8. *of giving to him and his ſeed the land of* Canaan; *I finde no ſufficient reaſon given.* This reference engages the adverſary, 1. In a contradiction to himſelf, who ſayes elſewhere, *the promiſe of the Goſpel was confirmed to* Abraham *by the ſigne of circumciſion.* He alſo contends that it was a mixt covenant, made up of ſpiritual and temporal mercies, and then it muſt take in the ſpiritual as well as the temporal Promiſe. All that know the nature of covenants, and uſe of Seales, know that the Seale ratifies all that the covenant containes: But the covenant (according to him) contained not barely the promiſe of the land of *Canaan*; and therefore the reference, muſt carry it farther than the land of *Canaan.* 2. It engages him in a contradiction to the Apoſtle, who makes circumciſion a ſigne and ſeale, not alone of the land of *Canaan*, but *of the righteouſneſſe of faith.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, It is ſaid, *But if it were yielded, that the inference were made peculiarly from the Promiſe,* verſe 7. *to be a God to* Abraham *and his ſeed; it muſt be proved that every Believers Infant childe is* Abrahams *ſeed, afore it be proved that the Promiſe belongs to them.* It muſt either be proved that they are *Abrahams* children, or have the priviledge of the Children of *Abraham,* which from *Geneſis* 9. 27. *Rom.* 11. 17. is ſufficiently proved, eſpecially being confirmed by thoſe Texts that carry the covenant in Goſpel-times to the iſſue. And for his exception that the *covenant was not made to every childe of* Abraham, though it were true, yet it would not ſerve his purpoſe, provided, that we in Goſpel-times are under the ſame covenant as was *Iſaac,* to whom the promiſes were made, If ſome of *Abrahams* children were left out, that concerns not us, ſo that we are taken in; yet the inſtance is very weak to prove it. *As appeares* (ſaith he) *verſe* 19. *concerning Iſhmael,* and *Heb.* 11. 9. that *Iſhmael* was himſelf in covenant, though not eſtabliſhed in covenant, (as God there, and *verſe* 21. promiſed concerning *Iſaac*) nor his ſeed never received, appeares not alone by the ſigne and ſeale which he received, *verſe* 23. which yet is ſufficient (for God to ſeale to a blanke is very ſtrange; to ſigne a covenant to a man never in covenant) but alſo from *Gal.* 4. 30. *What ſaith the Scripture? Caſt out the bond-woman and her ſonne, for the ſonne of the bond-woman ſhall not be heir with the ſonne of the free-woman.* A man caſt out of covenant, was before caſting out, in covenant; Ejection ſuppoſes admiſſion, unleſſe we will give way to our Authors dreame of Ejection by non-admiſſion. He was caſt out after the time of the ſolemnity of his admiſſion by circumciſion, as may be ſeen, *Gen,* 22. For that of *Heb.* 11. 9. it is a myſtery what he will make of it, unleſſe he will conclude, that becauſe *Abraham* ſojourned in the land of Promiſe, that therefore none were in covenant that were not taken into that land; ſo *Moſes* and *Aaron* will be found out of covenant.

It is further ſaid, *As for a viſible Church-ſeed of* Abraham, *that is neither his ſeed by nature, nor by ſaving faith, nor by excellency, in whom the Nations of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed, to wit, Chriſt; I know none ſuch in Scripture, therefore ſome men have fancied ſuch a kind of Church-ſeed, as it is called.* I know not how ſaving faith comes in, when a faith of profeſſion will ſerve the turne; The whole

whole of *Abrahams* ſeed had circumciſion as a ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of faith, when many of their Parents had no more than a faith of profeſſion.

Fourthly, *Were all theſe things yielded, yet the Propoſition* (as is ſaid) *would not be made good from hence.* All theſe we ſee are made good againſt his exceptions. Let us now ſee the ſtrength which is reſerved for the laſt puſh, for overthrow of this Propoſition. *The inference is not concerning title or right of infants to the initial ſeale, as if the covenant or promiſe of it ſelf did give that; but the inference is concerning* Abrahams *duty, that therefore he ſhould be the more engaged to circumciſe his poſterity.* This ſhould rather have been left to us for the ſtrengthening of our propoſition, than have made uſe of it himſelf for refutation of it. It was *Abrahams* duty to give them according to Gods command the initial Seale: in this we are agreed: whether it will thence follow that they had right and title to it, or were without right, let the Reader determine.

It is further ſaid, *He was engaged to circumciſe onely thoſe that are males, and not afore eight dayes, and not onely thoſe that were from himſelf, but alſo, all in his houſe, whoſe children ſoever they were, which apparently ſhewes that the giving Circumciſion was not commenſurate to the perſons intereſt in the Covenant, but was to be given to perſons as well out of the Covenant as in; If of Abrahams houſe, and not to all that were in the Covenant; to wit Females, which doth clearly prove that right to the initiall Seale, as it is called, of circumciſion, did not belong to perſons by vertue of the covenant, but by force of the command.* If it could be proved that *Abraham* kept Idolaters in his houſe, profeſſedly worſhipping a falſe god, and gave circumciſion to them in that faith and way of falſe worſhip; it would prove that a man might have the ſeale, and not be in covenant; but it would not prove that he might be in covenant, and be denied the Seale, and then infant-Baptiſme might be of eaſier proof. Though they were not in covenant, though they were not holy, yet they might be baptized. But I will not yield ſo much; I do not believe that *Abraham* carried circumciſion beyond the line of the covenant, and that he had thoſe in his houſe which were aliens from God; ſeeing I finde that Teſtimony of the Lord concerning him, *Gen.* 18. 19. *For I know him, that he will command his children, and his houſhold after him, and they ſhall*

keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgement; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham *that which he hath spoken of him.* And that resolution of *Joshua*, *That if others would serve the gods that their fathers served that were on the other side the floud, or the gods of the* Amorites *in whose land they dwell; yet he and his house would serve the Lord,* Josh. 24. 14, 15. As it is a private mans duty to serve the Lord, and not Idols, so it is the Master of the Families duty to see that the Lord and not Idols be worshipped in his house. As I do beleeve that if any of our adversaries had a profest Heathen in his Family, he would not keep him there, and not chatechize him, and that he would not during his profession of Heathenisme baptize him: So, I beleeve concerning *Abraham*, He catechized all that he took in as Heathens, and did not circumcise them in their Heathenisme. *This some Pædobaptists* (as is said) *are forced to confesse, when they grant the formal reason of the Jewes being circumcised, was the command, and the covenant he makes only a motive.* I wonder what need there is of an Argument to force such a confession. The reason I say, why Jewes were circumcised, and Christians baptized, is the command; were there a thousand covenants, and no institution of a signe, or seale, such a signe or seale, there could have been no circumcision, nor no Baptisme. The command is the ground, and the covenant is the directory to whom application is to be made. We say, all in covenant are entituled to the Seale for admission; but we pre-suppose an institution. They will have all Beleevers, and all Disciples baptized, which they cannot conclude upon their faith and knowledge barely, but upon the command to baptize Beleevers and Disciples; So that the command is with reference to the covenant, with reference to interest in the covenant. From these foregoing exceptions a conclusion is drawne, that *all this doth fully shew, that the proof of the connexion between, and the initial Seale without a particular command for it, is without any weight in it.* And I conclude, that it fully shewes that the proof of the connexion between the covenant and the initial Seale, (pre-supposing the institution of such a Seale, and a general command) is of that weight that all are meere frivolous trifles that are brought for exceptions against it.

Another Scripture holding out the connexion between the covenant and initial seale is, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. *Repent and be baptized*

tized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sinnes, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are a far off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Here I must mind the Reader of that which I have already spoken on this text, concerning this text, Chap. On which words after a brief *Analasis* (which there may be seen) I have grounded this argument, They to whom the covenant of promise appertains, have right to Baptisme. But the covenant of promise, belongs to men in a Church-state, and condition; together with their children, therefore, those that are in a Church-state, and condition, have right to Baptisme together with their children. My businesse being then, to assert the just latitude of the covenant, without respect to Baptisme or any other seale, I spoke only to the minor proposition, that the covenant extends it selfe not alone, to men professedly in a Church-state, but also to their children with them, and to that I think I have there spoke sufficient. Now I am put upon the proof of the major. That they, to whom the covenant of the promise appertaines, have right to baptisme. If this faile, it must be confest, that the ground of infant-Baptisme, as to this Text, falls with it, seeing their right is not asserted, *quâ* infants, no more than the right of men of growth or men of yeares, *quâ* of growth, or in yeares, but as they stand in reference to God in coventnt, and this is clear in the Text. *Be baptized, for the promise is to you, and to your children.* Because they are vested in the promise, they have their right and interest in the seale. If this do not hold, the Apostles argument falls to evade this full and cleare argument, one is bold to say, that in the expounding of these words there are almost as many mistakes as words, when words are only brought to convince us, of so many mistakes, though in a multiplication of exceptions.

First, *The Exposition is commonly carried as if the promise there meant, were the promise*, Gen. 17.7. *To* Abraham *and his seed, and this expounded as if it were meant that God would be a God to every Believer, and to his seed, in respect at least of visible Church-Membership.* When a promise is mentioned, and a seale, any man but he will presently understand that promise, which is ratified by such a seale. For discovery of their mistake that make any other reference of it, I shall referre the Reader to what I have said on these words *Chap.* 48. and to Master *Cobbets Vindication, Part.* 1. *Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 3.

Secondly, it is said, *They expound* [*is*] *is* Acts 2.39. *as if it were a promise of a thing to come, some outward priviledg to be conferred on them and their children, whereas the chief thing meant in the speech is, that as is expressly said by* Paul, *Acts* 13.32, 33. Yet no man is quoted for this Exposition of a thing to come, but on the contrary quotes Master *Cobbet* against it. It is meant of a present right, for as yet they were not broken off from the Olive, nor Gentiles grafted in, in their stead.

Thirdly, It is said, *It is taken as if* [*to you*] *were meant of those persons to whom he spake, as then Believers, and under that formal consideration, and then reasons are brought against it.* I do not interpret it of any present explicite Faith in Christ as the Messiah; though now this conviction, that so evidently appeared, did evidence them to be in an hopeful way, and with that Scribe not to be far from the Kingdome of God, and therefore he takes his opportunity, and presseth it on to come into the way of Believers in Christ Jesus.

Fourthly, It is said, [*your children*] *is expounded of their Infant-children, yea, it is carried as if of them only.* To this is sufficient spoken, *Chap.* 48.

As for that which follows, *They would have the promise to be*

to

to their children as theirs, whether they be called or no; which can be verified only in their sense of their infants, sith they maintain that even the children of Beleevers are not in covenant; the promise is not to them, they are not visible Church-members when they come to yeares of discretion, except they be called in their own persons, and accept the call. Children as theirs, whether they be called or no, is a contradiction; Children are called in their Parents call, and we say, they are in covenant, the Promise is made to them; they are visible Church-members till they reject the covenant, and deny their Membership, this is a calumny.

Fifthly, He sayes, *Whereas it is urged, that when it is said the promise is to all that are afarre off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call, which is expounded of the Gentiles, it is not added to their children:* To this in the same chapter sufficient is spoken.

A sixth, is the same with the tenth, and thither I shall refer the Reader.

Seventhly, It is said, *And in like manner we hold the command,* [*Be babtized every one of you*] *in a covenant-sense (that is, a new devised non-sense, such as we have no Dictionary yet to interpret words by) be baptized you and your children.* I am sure here is a non-sense devise to talk of Dictionaries, does *Calepin* or *Scapula*, *Rider* or *Thomasius* help us to compare covenant and seale, promises and Sacraments.

Eighthly, It is said, *Some would possesse people with this conceit as if* Peters *scope were to take away by* ver. 39. *an objection or scruple they would make. If we be baptized our selves, our children shall be in worse case, in respect of the priviledge our children had in the former dispensation of the covenant, when they had the seal of the covenant, if they be not to be baptized also; and that he answers them by assuring them that in this dispensation also their children were in covenant, and were to have the seale of the covenant.* And then addes, *There is not a word of any such scruple in the Text; nor is it likely that they were sollicitous about such an imaginary poor priviledge of their children.* I am of the same mind that there was no such scruple in their heads. This unhappy conceit of casting the seed out of covenant was not then in being, though I think the reason given is little to purpose.

Ninthly, He sayes, *They all do most grossely abuse the meaning of*

the Apoſtle, in interpreting the inference of the Apoſtle, ſignified by the particle [γὰρ, *for*, verſ. 39.] *which they would have to be this, you have right and warrant to be baptized; For the promiſe is to you and your children, as if the illative particle did inferre a warrant, or right for them and theirs to be baptized; whereas the thing inferred is not any right, which in a legal way they might claime; but is a plaine motive in a moral way urged to perſwade them to be baptized.* They do groſſely abuſe their own judgement in this way of refutation, as though the right in which they ſtood, could be no Topick, from which in a moral way the Apoſtle might perſwade them to Baptiſme. When *Shechaniah* perſwaded *Ezra* to the reformation of the marriage of ſtrange wives in theſe words, *Ariſe for the matter belongeth unto thee*, Ezra 10.4. Here was a motive in a moral way to call upon him to do it, and an Argument inferred, that it lay upon *Ezra* as a duty by command from God to ſet upon it. The reaſon added is worthy of obſervation: *This is manifeſt from the form of words*, ver. 38. *which if they had expreſt a right to Baptiſme by vertue of the promiſe, ſhould have been in the indicative mood in ſuch a forme as this; you are to be baptized, you may be baptized, you have right to it, the Miniſter ought to do it; but the words are in the imparative mood, exhorting them and perſwading them to it.* They have quite forgotten, that the words holding out their right, are in the *indicative mood*, ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν. *For the promiſe is to you and your children.* And here is a notable correction of the Apoſtle, he ſhould have ſaid, if this had been his meaning, you muſt be baptized; and he ſayes, *Ariſe, and be baptized.*

Laſtly, It is ſaid, *In the paraphraſes, which uſually in their diſputes*, Pædobaptiſts *make of* Acts 2.38, 39. *they put not any thing to anſwere the terme* [*repent*] *as if it ſtood for a cipher, but paraphraſe it thus, Ye may be baptized, you and your children; for the Promiſe is to you, and your children.* The ſixth exception was againſt our interpretation of the word *repent*, *ver.* 38. as if it were as much as to ſay, *Covenant for your ſelves and your children*; and here it is complained that it is left for a cipher. And the Author thinks he hath diſcovered the reaſon of this Omiſſion. *The putting the Word repent firſt, and be baptized after, doth manifeſtly overthrow their paraphraſe of a right to Baptiſme from the word of promiſe, and ſhew that the particle,* [*For*] *doth not prove a right*

to Baptiſme, but preſſe to a duty; and ſuch a duty as is to have repentance precedent, and that in every perſon that is to be baptized. I confeſſe it preſſeth to a duty, and ſuch a duty as is to have repentance precedent in them that at that time were his hearers, to intereſt themſelves, and with themſelves their children in this priviledge; But right and duty do not ſhoulder out one the other, but very well ſtand together; encouraging to a duty which is a priviledge as well as a duty, he fitly makes uſe of their intereſt as a motive. And they might ſee that the Apoſtle puts the promiſe in a greater latitude than he urgeth repentance; He ſpeakes to his hearers, when he ſayes *repent*; and he tells them, *that the promiſe is to them and to their children with them*: Whereas our Author preſſeth the precedency of the word, *repent*, to the command of being baptized, and elſewhere ſaith, *Peter doth exhort to Repentance and Baptiſme together, and in the firſt place perſwades to Repentance, then to Baptiſme, which ſhewes Repentance to be in order before Baptiſme*; I anſwer, as I did before *Chap.* 48. that theſe who had crucified Chriſt as a blaſphemer, as a ſeditious perſon; an impoſtor, muſt needs repent before they would accept Baptiſme in his name, or hope for remiſſion of ſinne by him. It had been loſt labour for the Apoſtle to have preſſed thoſe that had crucified Chriſt, and retained their former opinion of him, to become Diſciples to him, and to look to be ſaved by him; to perſwade them to look for remiſſion of ſinnes in his blood, who took themſelves to be without ſinne in ſhedding of it, and yet notwithſtanding this guilt (of which the Apoſtle would have them to repent) he ſhewes that they and their ſeed are under the promiſe of God, and puts them into a way in acceptation of Chriſt in the Goſpel-tender, in his preſent way of adminiſtration to be continued his people ſtill in covenant, and that (as is plainly enough ſignified) that they might enjoy it in their former latitude, *to them and to their children.* So that Maſter *Stephens* his Interpretation ſo much ſleighted by an adverſary, and repeated not in his words, but in his own paraphraſe upon them, is indeed the Apoſtles meaning. *The Apoſtle* (ſaith he. *pag.* 14.) *doth ſpeak to theſe Jewes who had crucified Chriſt; that if they would receive him as the particular* Meſſiah, *the ſame promiſe ſhould ſtill continue to them and their children in the new diſpenſation: And on this doth he build the word of command, to baptize father and childe;*

To this the word *repent* here referres as may be made plaine.

First, By taking into consideration the present state of this people, and that in several particulars.

1. As yet they had the promises with them, and were children of the covenant, *Acts* 3. 25. Though the Apostle, *Rom.* 9. 4. do distinguish between the covenants and the promises; yet to have the promises here, and to be children of the covenant, there seemes to be one. If any can distinguish them, this people, had the honour of both of them; God had not yet cast them out of a Church-state and covenant-relation.

2. They were in present danger to be cast off according to what Christ had foretold, *Mat.* 8. 12. *Mat.* 21. 43. Being so fast riveted to the ceremonial Law which now was dead, and presently grew deadly: God denying any presence (as hath been said) with them, now the substance was come.

3. These particular persons with whom *Peter* had to deale, were now well prepared for a free acceptation of a Gospel-way, under this administration, which Jesus Christ (having pulled down the Law of Ordinances) was to set up: Being amazed with the glory of the mircale which was wrought before their eyes, and convinced with the powerful application of the Prophets by *Peter* in that elegant Sermon, they fell upon enquiry what they should do.

Secondly, By comparing other Texts of Scripture, which may serve as a Comment to the clearing of this; especially two Texts of two Evangelists, recording the words of Christ, and holding out the impenitent obstinacy of the Jewes, standing out against every call to repentance, respective to their rigid pertinacious adhering to former dispensations, and opposition of that now tendered and offered to them. 1. That of our Saviour Christ, *Mat.* 21. 31, 32. Christ having held before them, *ver.* 28. 29, 30. the parable of *a certain man, that had two sonnes, and came to the first, and said, sonne, go work to day in my Vine-yard; He answered and said, I will not; but afterward he repented, and went; And he came to the second, and said likewise; and he answered and said, I go Sir, and went not*, and made appeale to them, *ver.* 31. *Whether of them twaine did the will of his father?* and they answering,

ing, *the first*: *Jesus saith unto them*, (as it followes in that and the next verse) *Verily I say unto you, that the Publicans and Harlots go into the Kingdome of God before you*; *For* John *came unto you in the way of righteousnesse, and ye beleeved him not; but the Publicans and the Harlots believed him. And ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might beleeve in him.* The Publicans and Harlots answer to the first brother, who from a professed rebellion against the command of God, by *Johns* preaching, were brought to repent, and accept of a Gospel-covenant, and enter into it by Baptisme. The chief Priests and Elders of the people (that here opposed Christ preaching the Gospel of the Kingdome) answer to the second brother that said, he would go into the Vine-yard, and went not; These repent not, but hold fast, and pertinaciously adhere to the way of old received, when the Publicans accept and imbrace the spiritual state of the Church by Christ set up. From this impenitence of these chiefs Priests and Elders with whom these joyned in crucifying Christ; *Peter* disswades, and exhorts to the repentance of the Publicanes and Harlots. The second Scripture which may give light to this text, is much parallel to this, *Luke* 7. 29, 30. Christ having given a large testimony to *John* and his Ministry; holds out the different effect that it took: First, in the people and the Publicanes, *ver.* 29. *And all the people that heard him, and the Publicanes justified God, being baptized with the Baptisme of John.* Secondly, in the Pharisees and Lawyers, *ver.* 30. *But the pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized.* They persisted in their old way, in opposition to that way held forth by *John*, approved by Christ, and refused baptisme, These with whom *Peter* had to deale, had gone with the Priests and Pharisees, kept full pace with them even to the guilt of the death of Christ, they were now in a good way to follow the steps of the Publicanes and People, to embrace the counsel of God, and accept baptisme, their impenitence had held them from entrance into a new covenant-way by baptisme, *Peter* therefore exhorts to repent and be baptized.

Thirdly, This appeares by the Text it selfe, whereas they will have the illative particle *For*, to inferre no warrant or right in them to be baptized, but onely a motive in a moral way urged, as we have heard in the last exception. It is worth our enqui-

ry to learne what good interpretation ſuitable to *Peters* exhortation, they put here on thoſe words, *To you is the promiſe made, and to your children,* excluding all conſideration of right, in them and their children, *Becauſe Chriſt was promiſed to them and their children, therefore they muſt repent and be baptized.* Not to inſiſt upon that juſt exception of Maſter *Cobbet,* page 23. *That the Apoſtle doth not ſay, the promiſe was to you as in reference to the time of making it to the fathers, with reſpect unto them, or in reference to Chriſt, who was not now to come, but already come, as the Apoſtle proveth from* ver. 3. *to* 37. *Nor is it the uſe of the Scripture when mentioning promiſes as fulfilled, to expreſſe it thus in the preſent tenſe, the promiſe is to you, or to ſuch and ſuch, but rather to annex ſome expreſſion that way which evinceth the ſame,* giving inſtance almoſt in twenty ſeveral texts, which utterly overthrows his expoſition. Let them tell us why in this moral perſwaſive holding out a bare motive to perſwade the parents onely, the children (not concerned in the thing and in an utter incapacity) ſhould be mentioned. And why the words ſhould be carried in that way that intereſt in covenant and covenant-ſeales formerly ran, and no right at all to covenant or covenant-ſeales intended? This gloſſe puts too much violence upon the words. But carrying it on as a diſſwaſive from perſiſtance in their former way of old covenant legal rites, and perſwading to embrace the way appointed by him, whom God had made both Lord and Chriſt, it ſingularly anſwers, as, to their preſent condition, yet in covenant, though in eminent danger to be caſt out of covenant, ſo, alſo to the words of the text, holding out a covenant-right in Scripture language according to the grand Charter of heaven. *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed;* ſo that I hope by this time, the intelligent Reader will eaſily perceive the frivolous ſhifts inſtead of a ful refutation that's here brought to avoid *Pædobaptiſts* proofs of a word of command to Baptize infants from this Scripture.

As theſe Scriptures plainly hold out the neceſſary connexion of the covenant and initial ſeale, ſo, the evidence of reaſon is cleare for it. No man that ſtands enrighted or legally intereſted, in any priviledge, or poſſeſſion, may be denied that ceremony or ſeal which is appointed for confirmation. A copy-hold being found the next immediate tenant, of a copy-hold-right muſt not be denied, but received according to the ceremony, or ſolemni-

ty

ty of the place, whensoever the King did grant, out letters-patents, the Lord Keeper might not deny the seale, the Lords Commissioners, may not now deny it to any, that by a just grant have interest. This were to keep a childe out of his fathers house, a servant from his place of abode and residence; when Christ was so much displeased with his Disciples on like occasion, these may well expect to be under as high displeasure. Having thus made good the point, it remaines that I take off some objections, and meet with some quarrels that are raised against it.

If there be any necessary connexion between the covenant and the seale, it must be (saith one) *either, by reason of some necessary connexion between the termes which is none, for it is but a common accident to a man that hath a promise or a covenant made to him, that he should have a special signe, it may adesse vel abesse à subjecto, it may be present or absent from the subject.* Giving some instances of covenants without seales. *Answ.* 1. By way of concussion it will be easily granted, that a covenant may stand alone without a seale annexed? but where a seale is appointed for confirmation, (as there hath been in the Church ever since God took a people to himself out of *Abrahams* loines) there is a necessary connexion. This answer he foresees, and sayes: *But you will say, All that are* fœderati *should be* signati, *since the solemne covenant with* Abraham; *But neither is this certaine, sith we finde no such thing concerning* Melchizedek *and* Lot, *that lived in* Abrahams *time, nor concerning* Job *that it's conceived lived after his time.* If we read nothing to confirme it, the Reader sees nothing to contradict it; There is added, *But you will say, it is true of all the* fœderati *in* Abrahams *family. But neither is that true, for male-children before the eighth day, and women though* fœderatæ, *yet were not to be signed.* Is there no connexion between them, because he that receives into covenant and appoints the seale, hath prescribed a time when it shall be applied? A man that hath a grant from King or State, hath *ipso facto* right to the seale, and the right necessarily followes upon the grant, though he must stay till a sealing day before he possesse it.

For the exception of women, though *fœderatæ*, yet were not to be circumcised; I say, 1. Master *Marshal* hath sufficiently answered, that they were of the circumcision, and it was an excep-

tion against *Sampson* by his parents that he would go to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines, *Judg.* 14. 3. Had he married in *Israel*, as he ought in obedience to God and his parents, he had married a wife of the circumcised, though that sex by nature is in an incapacity of that signe or seale. In diverse places of *England*, the husband being admitted by verdict of a Jury into an estate, the wife is virtually admitted; his admission is her admission, so it was in circumcision. 2. They had doubtlesse actually received that signe of circumcision as in New Testament times they do Baptisme, *Acts* 8. 12. *Acts* 16. 15. but that it was a signe whereof they were in an incapacity. It is farther added, *If then I should farther grant the conclusion, That infants of beleevers were to be* signati, *yet you would not say they are to be partakers of the Lords Supper, because it is not appointed for them; So in like manner if it were granted you that infants of beleevers were to be signed, yet it followes not that they are to be baptized, unlesse you can prove that it is appointed to them; and the truth is, if it were granted that children were* fœderati, *yet it were a high presumption in us to say therefore they must be* signati, *without Gods declaration of his minde; and if it were granted they must be* signati, *it were in like manner a high presumption in us to say, therefore they must be baptized, without Gods declaration of his minde concerning that Ordinance.* To this a reply is made by another hand, that there is difference between a seale for initiation, and a seale for confirmation; a seale, wherein no more is of necessity, than to be passive; and that wherein we are to be active; yet to come more near to them, I am content to yield the conclusion, supposing that his argument is of force, Every Church-member hath true title to all Church-priviledges; But infants are Church-members, the Lords Supper is a Church-priviledge; and therefore infants have true title to it. But then I must distinguish *jus ad rem*, and *jus in re*, every infant hath right to it, yet by reason of infancy hath his actual interest suspended; *Paul* by birth had right to al the priviledges of the City of *Rome*, being born free, *Acts* 22. 28. ye: it does not follow that he was to give his vote, or appear in Assemblies as a free Citizen in the time of his minority; *James* the sixth was crowned in *Scotland*, and *Henry* the sixth in *England*, in the time of their minority, so that they were reckoned among the Kings of Nations; yet neither of them did in their

own

own persons exercise *regalia* till yeares of discretion. As these infants of title were crowned, so infants that are Church-members are to be baptized, when yet an infant can no more partake, as a Christian ought, of the Lords Supper, than an infant King can wield the great things of his Kingdome. An infant-heir from the first instant of his fathers death, and a posthumous childe from the time of his birth, stands seized of his fathers inheritance; The whole title is vested in him, how ample soever, and in no other, and he is received into it, and lives upon it, yet he is held from the managing of it till he can improve for his own and the publike benefit; So that the taking into covenant is a sufficient declaration of Gods minde, that the signes and seals in an orderly way should be granted to them, and all these appeare to be cavils, and not answers.

As, these exceptions are causlesly taken against the connexion between the covenant and eale; so, quarrels are raised, against some phrases in common use among Divines relating to this thing, as making the metaphor of a seale the *Genus* of a Sacrament, which (if an errour) was the Apostles errour, *Rom.* 4. 11. and many such like, with which it is needlesse to trouble the Reader.

CHAP. LVII.

The with-holding infants of Christian parents from Baptisme is the sin of Sacriledge.

HEnce farther followes, that the Prohibition of infant-Baptisme or with-holding them from that Ordinance that are the issue of Christians, is the sinne of Sacriledge. This is plaine from the premisses, they are the Lords, *His heritage*, *Psal.* 127. 3. The *Lords servants*, Levit. 25. 42. *holy ones*, Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Children of the covenant*, Acts 3. 25. *interessed in the priviledges of the people of God*, Mark 10. 14. Therefore they are to be given to God, *Cæsar* will account it a robbery, if that which is his due be denied; *God* will account it a robbery, if that which is his be denied; *Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsars, and unto God the things that are Gods*, Matth. 22. 21. Adversaries fasten the brand of will-worship on the practice of it; But if

Infant-baptisme cannot be charged with will-worship.

Baptiſme be any worſhip according to the minde of Chriſt, then infant-Baptiſme is out of all danger or poſſibility of will-worſhip. In caſe infants were not within the verge, yet their Baptiſme could be no will-worſhip; we ſet not up of our ſelves the Ordinance that we apply to them, but make application of the Ordinance that Chriſt hath inſtituted; In caſe they have no title, there is onely a miſapplication of worſhip inſtituted, and no deviſe of worſhip. To this is replied, and demand made *whether infant-communion were not will-worſhip? whether baptizing of Bells were not will-worſhip? yet theſe are but miſapplications of an inſtituted ordinance to a wrong ſubject.* I anſwer, none of theſe were will-worſhip, nor yet the Baptiſme of the Horſe in *Huntingdon*-ſhire, but the horrid prophanation of an inſtituted worſhip; Baptiſme is ſtill Gods, but the application mans, and here the will is not carried to a deviſe of an ordinance, but alone to the application of it. Our adverſaries making it a corruption of the Ordinance of Baptiſme, acquit it from will-worſhip: But in infant-Baptiſme we neither deviſe an Ordinance, nor of our own heads make application of it: we know they belong to the family of Jeſus Chriſt, we know Chriſts order to admit them to the priviledge that was proper to thoſe of his family, and as faithful ſtewards we follow the will of our Maſter, not our own will, but the will of Chriſt Jeſus. Could they waſh their hands of Sacriledge, as we are able to clear our wills and wits from deviſe of a worſhip, it were better with them; The times were, when men looked upon things conſecrate (as holy to the Lord) in a multiplying glaſſe; we had holy places, holy Altars, in which ſome of our preſent opponents went too farre to the grief of the godly, and farther than the times with their ſtreames needed to have borne them, had he been meerely preſt, and no voluntier in it. I wiſh they would ſeriouſly conſider, how ordinary it is with men to carry on their wayes in extreames, and out of ſuperſtition to runne upon Sacriledge. It is well known how apt the people of *Iſrael* were for idolatrous wayes, and ready to embrace every ſuperſtition after the way of the Heathen, and in conformity to them; yet after the Babyloniſh captivity, they were quite taken off that courſe; What wickedneſſe ſoever they were otherwiſe guilty of, yet it is obſerved that they kept themſelves from Idols; That ſinne had ſo conſumed them, that at laſt

Extremes are dangerous.

it

it had even wearied them: And then (as it appeares from the Apoſtle) they runne upon this extreame, to which we are here ſpeaking; Therefore when in other things they are charged with the ſame ſinne that (as men of knowledge) they condemned in others, *Thou that preacheſt that another ſhould not ſteale, doeſt thou ſteale? Thou that ſayeſt a man ſhould not commit adultery, doeſt thou commit adultery?* And the *Series* of the words leading to a charge of Idolatry, the Apoſtle changes the phraſe, and ſaith, *Thou that abhorreſt Idols, doeſt thou commit Sacriledge?* Rom. 2. 22. This was now their ſinne in the other extreame, not on their own heads to put a ſuppoſition of holineſſe to the Lord on any thing for worſhip, but to convert to other uſes that which was ſanctified as holy. I know ſome underſtand theſe words in a Metaphor, that by Sacriledge is meant the robbing of God of his honour by ſinne againſt him; but that interpretation the next words contradict, in diſtinct words forbidding that Sacriledge, if they will ſo call it. *Origen* will turne it into an Allegory, and underſtand the ſpoyling of the ſenſe of Scriptures, and ſtealing Chriſt out of the Scriptures; But the text is plaine, that it is a reproof applied to their capacities, and in the letter convincing, as well as the former of ſtealing, and adultery, *The plaine ſenſe, (ſaith Peter Martyr) is the meaning.* May not I now ſay that theſe things are our examples, to the intent that we ſhould not runne with them in theſe extreames from an abhorrency of the one to the other, from an abhorrency of Idols to the guilt of Sacriledge, which according to the Schoolmen is *rei ſacræ violatio*, or *rerum ſacrarum furtum, a deteigning from God that which for an holy uſe is ſeparate for him*, which ſeparation is either of perſons, or of inanimate, or irrational creatures. I know there are thoſe that affirme that there is no ſuch ſeparation for God in Goſpel times, and conſequently there can be no ſuch thing as this ſin of Sacriledge in our times, for what is not, cannot be thus violated or detained. As to the ſeparation of inanimate or unreaſonable creatures it cannot be fully denied, nor yet muſt it fully be yielded, that no ſuch things are now to be accounted as ſeparate to the Lord, we muſt therefore diſtinguiſh. Theſe may be ſaid to be ſeparate for God, and conſequently holy, two wayes. 1. By divine inſtitution and appointment, So the Temple and Utenſils of the Temple were holy. 2. By divine approbation, when men ſet

The Jewes leaving idolatry, run upon Sacriledge.

Separation for God of perſons or of inanimate or unreaſonable creatures. Whether Sacriledge be any New Teſtament ſin.

Separation for God either by inſtitution or approbation.

ſet them apart for advancement of ſuch an holy uſe as God approves. The former we confeſſe was proper to the times of the Law, but the latter yet remaines in Goſpel-times, and upon this account *Ravanellus* juſtly makes the ſinne of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, (in keeping back part of the price of their land that was ſet apart by them for the ſervice of the Church) to be the ſinne of Sacriledge. The land before ſale was his own, and the price after ſale was his own, but now it was to ſerve (by their voluntary act) onely to a purpoſe that was holy; The detaining of it is the violation of that which is holy. And in this way, both the places of publick worſhip, and the revenues for maintenance of thoſe that attend upon this worſhip, are ſeparate for God: It will be thought ſomewhat out of my way to ſpeak to theſe things, yet having ſo fair an occaſion, I ſhall take the liberty of a few words, concerning the places of worſhip, ſhall ſpeak ſomewhat in the [negative,] and by way of conceſſion; There is not any ſuch holineſſe in them, as in the Tabernacle and Temple, This is diſavowed by Chriſt, *John* 4. 23. Theſe had the preheminence above our places of meeting in foure ſeveral particulars.

Places for worſhip and maintenance of thoſe that attend upon worſhip ſeparate by divine approbation.

Poſitious concerning places. Negative.

1. They had their inſtitution, and immediate injunction from God, *Exod* 35.10,11. 1 *Kings* 5.5. 1 *Chron.* 22.9, 10.

2. Their direction and preſcription, *Heb.* 8.5.

3. Their promiſe, not alone reſpective to the worſhip, but the place, *Exod.* 29. 42, 43.

4. Their ſanction or penalty in regard of typical prophanation, *Num.* 19. 20. In all of theſe particulars we muſt give the Temple and Tabernacle the preeminence, beſides that the Temple and Tabernacle were but one for all *Iſrael*, we have many. In the affirmative I ſhall lay down ſeveral poſitions.

Poſitive,

Firſt, there is equal warrant and reaſon for the building of our places of meeting, for the worſhip of God, as there was for the Synagogues of the Jewes; Though we put no ſuch holineſſe on theſe places to parallel them with the Temple, yet they have equal warrant, and are to have equal reſpect with the Synagogues which the Jewes had in every City, *Acts* 15.21. Not only in *Judea*, but where they were diſperſed, *Acts* 13. 14, 15. There is no word in all the Scripture for the erecting of theſe Synagogues, no mention made of them but once, where a ſad com-

plaint

plaint is made of the burning of them, *Pſal.* 74. 8. But the people of God being by Gods command to be inſtructed in the Law, they built them places for conveniency of meeting, and in ſuch places they met, The Law was there preacht, Chriſt and his Apoſtles did preach there, our places of meeting then ſtand in equal honour with theſe Synagogues: Thoſe that can ſay any thing for theſe Synagogues, which we cannot ſay for our publick places of meeting, let them produce it.

2. There is as much reaſon and equal warrant to call our places of meeting by the uſual common Name of Churches, as to call theirs by the common name of Synagogues; Nothing can be ſaid to condemne the uſe of the word Church for our place of meeting, but the like may be ſaid to condemne, the uſe of the word Synagogue for their place of meeting. The Scriptures therefore calling theirs Synagogues, *Luke* 7. 5. *Acts* 18. 7. we may therefore fitly call ours Churches. That which is objected againſt the word Church, is, that Church ſignifies not a houſe of wood or ſtone, but a ſociety or fellowſhip of men, profeſſing faith in Jeſus Chriſt; So alſo the word Synagogue ſignifies not a building, but ſuch an aſſembly or ſociety likewiſe; *In the ordinary ſignification* (ſaith *Spanhemius*) *Synagogue ſignifies the aſſembly, not the place where they aſſemble, but in the New Teſtament it is ſometimes put for the place of aſſembling*, Luke 7. 5. Acts 18. 7. Synagogue, and Church, are one and the ſame, both ſignifie the aſſembly met; As the one, ſo alſo the other may be applied by an uſual figure to the place of meeting, and therefore where it is ſaid, *the Centurion loveth our Nation, and hath built us a Synagogue*, Luke 7. 5. the laſt Annotations have it, *a Church*; So that they that would reforme this language, which calls our places of meeting a Church, muſt reform the language of Scripture, which calls the like places by a name of the ſame ſignification.

Thirdly, it is a pious work to erect theſe Churches, or publick meeting places for advancement of the knowledge and worſhip of God, as may be evinced from that Narrative of the Centurion, *Luke* 7. and the tranſactions between Chriſt and him. 1. There are ſeveral evidences of piety in the man. 1. He is tenderly affected with his ſervants ſickneſſe. 2. He ſends to Chriſt for

cure, makes to him as *Mary* for *Lazarus*. 3. He evidences a mighty faith in Chriſt, beleeves that Chriſts word without his preſence will work for his ſervants recovery. 4. Makes this good by an argument from the leſſe to the greater, *I my ſelfe am a man under authority, and have men under me*, if my word ſtands, who am an inferiour perſon, how much more then thine? 5. The Lord Chriſt ſpeaks by way of commendation and admiration of his faith, *ver.* 9. 2. There are evidences of the warranty of his fact. 1. The Elders of the Jewes take notice of it, and upon this account commend him to Chriſt to have his requeſt gratified, *Lord, he is worthy for whom thou ſhouldeſt do this: For he loveth our Nation, and hath built us a Synagogue.* 2. This takes with Chriſt, *Then Jeſus went with them.*

Fourthly, being a pious work as we ſee to erect them (not only in the judgement of this Centurion, but of the Jewes, yea and of Chriſt Jeſus) it is then an evil, a ſinne to demoliſh and deſtroy them, this followes from the former; If piety ſet them up, ſinne pulls them down: If he be a good Townſman that builds a Market-houſe, a School, &c. then he is an ill-deſerving one that does ruine it. If the Centurion have his praiſe for building a Synagogue, then it muſt be their reproach that deface them. Farther we have a ſad complaint of ſuch acts of Sacriledge done by adverſaries, enemies, blaſphemers, *Pſal.* 74. 7, 8. *They have caſt fire into thy Sanctuary, they have defiled by caſting down the dwelling place of thy name to the ground: They have burnt up all the Synagogues of God in the Land.* The burning of the Temple in the firſt place is complained of, the dwelling place of Gods name. Then of the Synagogues which were ſcattered through the Land, all theſe were deſtroyed and conſumed. This the godly lay to heart, as a ſore evil, and complaine of it heavily and ſadly.

Miniſtry maintenance aſſerted.

1. What conſcientiouſly is due.

Secondly, As to the revenue for maintenance of thoſe that attend upon this worſhip, I might ſpeak, 1. To that which is conſciencioſly due, in which the minde of God is, that it be not detained, as might be made good, 1 By the Apoſtles authority. 2. By his Arguments and Reaſons. 1. By his authority, *Gal.* 6. 6. *Let him that is taught in the Word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.* Subſiſtence is of due to him that teacheth from them that are taught according to their abilities, and

the

the proportion of their possessions. This is no almes or free gift, but a due debt. The Apostle gives it in charge, and takes off excuses and evasions in the words that follow; *Be not deceived, God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reape.* And as the Apostle by his authority orders it, so he gives his reasons for it, which might be enlarged to a great length from 1 *Cor.* 9. He first argues from the practice of other Apostles, of all the Apostles except himself and *Barnabas*, *ver.* 5, 6. *I only and* Barnabas *have we not power to forbear working?* 2. He argues from a civil right and common equity in three particular instances, *ver.* 7. 1. In Souldiers, *Who goeth a warfarre at any time at his own charges?* 2. In Husbandmen, *Who planteth a Vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof.* 3. In Shepherds, *Who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milke of the flock?* All these live of their labours, Ministers who undergo equal labours must live of theirs. Thirdly, he argues from the command of the Law, *ver.* 8, 9. *Say I these things as a man? or saith not the Law the same also? For it is written in the Law of* Moses, *thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the Oxe that treadeth out the corne. Doth God take care for Oxen?* Where two observations are cleare. 1. The Law of force is to Christians; and secondly, Ministers must live on their Ministerial pains. Fourthly, he reasons from communicative justice, *ver.* 11. *If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?* Whence three things are clear. 1. That the things of earth carry no proportion with the things of heaven. 2. By the Ministery of the Word the things of heaven are conferred. 3. When Ministers conferre on their people the things of heaven, there is all equity that they should receive the things of earth. Fifthly, he argues from the provision made in the Law, *ver.* 13. *Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the Temple? And they which wait at the Altar, are partakers with the Altar?* If the Law judge it equal for the Levites, to live on the paines that they take about holy things, then it is equal that the Ministers of the Gospel live of their paines. But the Law made such provision for the Levites, not with an hungry, narrow proportion, but in a liberal and honourable way; See Doctor *Reynolds* on *Psal.* 110. *pag.* 478. Sixthly, he argues from Christs institution in a parallel way. *ver.* 14. *Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the Gospel should live*

of the Goſpel; whence we ſee at large that it is the minde of Chriſt that this be not detained in caſe the Apoſtle (as he ſayes, 1 *Cor.* 2. 16.) hath the minde of Chriſt.

2. What is legally due.

For that which is legally due either by order of the Sate, or a voluntary gift of any perſon, to that end, it ought not to be alienated; There is equity in the thing (as we have heard at large) when authority ſhall put upon it their ſanction, it is a farther confirmation; for a voluntary gift, in caſe *Ananias* may not revoke his own, none may alienate anothers; *If it be a mans Teſtament, no man diſanulleth it*, Gal. 3. 14. The poore muſt enjoy that which by free gift is ſetled upon them, ſo a Corporation, and ſo the Miniſtery in like manner. To deſtroy publick places (of neceſſary and convenient uſe) for advancement of publick worſhip, to alienate lively-hood which is in order to it, is to devoure that which is holy, reductively holy: not by Gods particular inſtitution, with limit to that thing or place, but by his Warranty and approbation.

Separation of perſons, for God is of another ſort; they that are thus ſeparate, God ownes; not only as reductively, but relatively holy: This is either peculiarly, in ſome way of ſpecial calling, to do ſuch work as is holy, of which there were ſeveral ſorts in the time of the Law, Prieſts, Levites, Nazarites, Singers, Porters, which will not be denied, and in a parallel way Miniſters of the Goſpel as we have ſeen, 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. *Acts* 13. 2. *The Holy Ghoſt ſaid, Separate me* Saul *and* Barnabas *for the work whereunto I have called them.*

Here an eminent adverſary gives in his aſſent, and ſayes, *Paſtors and Teachers, or Preſbyters to teach, and governe the Church of God; I am aſſured are a divine inſtitution, and a very merciful gift of Chriſt*, Fphes. 4. 11, 12, 13. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Acts 14. 23. 1 Tim. 3. 1. Titus 2. 5. *to whom people ſhould yield obedience*, Heb. 13. 7. *and yield maintenance liberally*, 1 Cor. 9. 14. Gal. 6. 6. 1 Tim. 5. 17, 18. *If any go about to extirpate them, let him be accurſed as an enemy to Chriſt and his Church.* This the evidence of truth forces him to confeſſe, though preſently he takes againe all that from them, which he had under ſuch an Anathema yielded them. He that gives to every Free-man of *London*, in caſe competently qualified, the whole power and authority of the

Lord

Lord Major, to every free Subject of *England*, the whole power of the Lord Chief Juſtice, goes a deſtructive way for extirpation of thoſe places, or functions. This I think all will grant, when each man may do their work, they ſhall ſoon have little honour in the naked title. Now our Authour gives the work of preaching promiſcuouſly to all. *Notwithſtanding what ſuch and ſuch have ſaid, I ſtill conceive* (ſaith he) *that not onely for triall of expectants, but alſo upon other occaſions, perſons not ordained, may be permitted, yea deſired to preach in the Pulpits.* If all that ſuch have ſaid cannot withſtand this conceit, me thinkes his Anathema (but now pronounced) ſhould affect him ſomewhat. Let him take heed leſt he let them looſe to runne upon ſo heavy a curſe that hangs over thoſe of ſuch principles. It were to be wiſhed he would have anſwered their reaſons in a better temper than he hath done other mens, or have given in ſomewhat of his own farther than his bare conceit. I confeſſe, he ſpeakes ſomewhat by way of caution. *Nevertheleſſe I am againſt the courſes of many Souldiers, and others who againſt the denial of able Teachers, to whom the teaching of the people is committed, love to get into the Pulpits of the ableſt men, to vent their peculiar conceits, and often-times their pernicious Errors, not regarding to preach to the ignorant the clear Truths of Faith, and a holy life in places where they have no Preacher, but to new Converts; to pervert them, and with-draw them from their able Teachers, and to diſquiet them and their Congregations by frivolous exceptions.* If they have but their liberty to become Pulpit-men, and may conſecrate themſelves without laying on of hands (which is confeſt to be of divine inſtitution) they will ſoon be their own carvers for the choiſe of Pulpits, They will be the judges of the ability or inſufficiency of Miniſters gifts where they quarter. All ſhall be clear truths that they vent; Break down the Apoſtles fence, that by appointment from Jeſus Chriſt he hath ſet up, *Let them be proved, and then do the office*, and then a mound, Segges and Bul-ruſhes will ſoon be trodden down. The God of order hath taken more care; The diſpenſation of the Sacraments is with theſe every mans work, as well as preaching the Word, which he notably proves againſt Maſter *Baxter*. *Doth the Embaſſage of Chriſt, diſpenſing of his myſteries, beſeeching in his ſtead, &c. conſiſt* (ſaith one) *in breaking bread, delivering it; bidding, take, eat, &c? If it do, then a non-preaching*

Miniſter who doth theſe things, may yet be an Embaſſador of Chriſt, and Steward of his myſteries; then the breaking bread, &c. is a converting Ordinance, as Mr. Pryn *held, which Mr.* Gilleſpy *and Mr.* Rutherford *deny.*

If it be granted that this is the whole of a Miniſters work, is it no part of it? are they to do nothing elſe, if they are to do this? If it be an edifying Ordinance (which neither Maſter *Gilleſpy* nor Maſter *Rutherford* will deny) it is a part of their function. *For my part,* (ſaith he) *I think to be an Embaſſador of Chriſt, and to beſeech in his ſtead,* 2 Cor. 5.20. *to be a Steward of the myſteries of God,* 1 Cor. 4.1. *are all one, as to preach the Goſpel, and that the Aſſembly did miſalledge the Text,* 1 Cor. 4.1. *as they have done the other, to prove that neither Sacrament may be diſpenſed by any, but a Miniſter of the Word lawfully ordained,* Confeſſion of Faith, *Chap.* 27. *Sect.* 4. Perhaps when the Aſſembly voted that Text for this purpoſe, they had read that which our Author elſewhere delivers, ſpeaking of admiſſion to Baptiſme, he ſaith, *A Miniſter in this caſe is to act as a Steward, who is to deale according to his Lords will, not his own minde.* Is not Baptiſme then one of the myſteries of which they are Stewards? or perhaps they thought that the Sacraments are contained in the Goſpel, and are *verbum viſibile,* being teaching ſignes. A man that will oppoſe ſo quick-ſighted a Society, ſhould have ſaid ſome little at leaſt to purpoſe; It is ſaid, that *Myſteries of God never ſignifie Sacraments in Scripture, but the Goſpel, Epheſ.* 6.19. *Rom.* 16.25. I never took thoſe to be oppoſites, but have ever thought that Sacraments are included within the Goſpel; we have ever taken them for ſignes and Seales, and if they do not teach Goſpel-truths, and ſeale Goſpel-promiſes, Miniſters are not to diſpenſe them, nor Chriſtians to intermeddle with them: But *Chamiers* authority is here brought, *In Scripturis* μυστήριον *uſurpari pro ipſo rei ſacræ ſigno, profecto impoſtura eſt.* And is not the Quotation of this from him a greater impoſture, who ever took the bare ſigne to be the Sacrament? then the definition would fall that calls it a viſible ſigne of an inviſible grace. If marriage be not that great myſtery, *Epheſ.* 5.32. but the union of Chriſt and his Church, then certainly the Sacraments (in which we have that communion and fellowſhip with Chriſt) 1 *Cor.* 10.16.) are not excluded from the number of myſteries.

As there is a ſeparation for this publick work, ſo there is alſo a ſeparation more general, from Idols to God, upon which account Chriſtians are called Saints. Men holy by dedication to the Lord, *as the Temple of God which is holy*, 1 Cor. 3. 17. Our adverſaries ſome of them at leaſt baptize, and by Baptiſme conſecrate men to God, upon no other account than ſuch a ſeparation by a profeſſion of Faith and holineſſe, as ſome of the moſt eminent of them expreſſe themſelves. To deny Baptiſme to theſe in their own account, can be no other than Sacriledge. This profeſſion gives them intereſt in God by way of viſible communion; and therefore they muſt be given to God. Children are ſeparated for God, and ſtiled (as we have heard) holy; if they yield them this intereſt, they cannot deny them Baptiſme, and avoid this charge of Sacriledg, They are ſervants of God and of his holy Family, and they are to have admittance into the Family. In caſe they deny it, they muſt leave them *without God*, and ſo *without Hope*; ſo that of neceſſity one will follow, that either they robbe God of them as belonging to him, or denying their intereſt in him, they doome them to deſtruction. If they have no intereſt in God, then they periſh; If they have their intereſt, then they are Sacrilegiouſly with-held from him. Many have obſerved how God hath followed the ſinne of Sacriledge, above other ſinnes with his judgements; but inſtances can be given of no piece of Sacriledge, ſo ſadly followed by the hand of heaven, as this of deteining Infants from Baptiſme. They have heard not a few, and it may well move pity in all Readers to take notice of their anſwers. No conſent of Hiſtory, nor authority of men, of moſt eminent piety can work their belief of ſuch a hand of God, giving up ſo many of their party to ſuch abominations. I ſhall to that which they have heard from Maſter *Marſhal* and Maſter *Baxter*, adde only one teſtimony of *Martine Bucer* in his Dedicatory Epiſtle before his Comment on the Evangeliſts, relating to the Doctrine of Antipædobaptiſme, he ſaith, *Which opinion hath brought ſuch an heap of Errors, and Schiſmes, that there is nothing ſo abhorrent from reaſon, can be read of any of the Heretickes of former times, which hath not been in foure yeares ſpace revived, and found followers, that this alone may render that root ſuſpected to all that follow after godlineſſe, from whence ſuch unhappy branches have ſprouted, and out of which they have budded.*

Quæ ſententia, tantum ſecum invexit jam errorum & ſchiſmatum agmen, ut nihil de ullis ſuperiorum temporum Hæreticis legatur tam inſanum, quod non fuerit reductum proximo quadriennio ſubſq; rurſum ſectatores invenerit, ut vel unum hoc pietatis ſtudioſis radicem hanc ſuſpectam meritò reddere debuerit, ex qua tam infauſta germina ſupplularunt.

CHAP.

CHAP. LVIII.

The Children of all that are Chriſtians in profeſſion, are by vertue of Covenant-Intereſt, to be received into the Church by Baptiſme.

THen it farther followes by way of neceſſary Corollary, that according to the Parents Intereſt in the Covenant, the childe hath Intereſt in the Sacrament of Baptiſm; But all profeſſing Parents ſeparate from Idols, and profeſſing the worſhip of the true God, though nothing more of a Chriſtian be in them, in the latitude as hath been ſhewn, are in covenant; the infants of all theſe then have intereſt in Baptiſme. The Major cannot be queſtioned by any that acknowledge a right in infants, derived from their Parents for Baptiſm, for it is intereſt in the covenant that gives the title to parent and infant: The Minor I have abundantly proved. The covenant muſt either be made to appeare to run in a more narrow channel (which I ſuppoſe will hardly be done) that a man in Ignorance, or in Impenitency, as he does not keep covenant, ſo he never entred covenant, or elſe this muſt neceſſarily follow. To aſſert this by [a] Arguments.

[a] Arguments evincing the right of Chriſtians in this latitude.

Firſt, Their children whom God owns as his peculiar people, above others have right to Baptiſme. This cannot be denied; either theſe have a juſt claim, or elſe no children at all. But God owns all in viſible profeſſion, as his people, *Iſa.* 1. 2. *Iſa.* 5. 13. *Hoſ.* 4. 6. *Jer.* 2. 11, 13, 31, 32. *Jer.* 4. 22. *Jer.* 5. 51. therefore the children of viſible profeſſors have right to Baptiſm.

Secondly, Their children, that are brought forth to God, by their parents, have right to Baptiſm; This is as plain: But viſible profeſſors bring forth children to God, *Ezek.* 16. 20. therefore their children have right to Baptiſm.

Thirdly, Thoſe children whoſe Parents are children of the Kingdome of God, have their title to Baptiſme; But thoſe that are in ſin, and in a way to be caſt out for ſin, are children of the Kingdome, *Mat.* 8. 12. *Mat.* 21. 43. *Ergo* the children of Parents in ſin have right to Baptiſm.

Fourthly, The children of thoſe, who are themſelves Diſciples of Chriſt, ought to be baptized; But men in ſin are Diſciples of Chriſt,

Christ, *Joh.* 6.66. whole Nations, among whom are many wicked ones, are Disciples, *Matth.* 28. 19. The children then of those that are in sinne, ought to be baptized.

Fifthly, The children of those that are of the number of brethren in the faith of the Gospel, have right to Baptism: But men in sinne are brethren in the faith of the Gospel, 1 *Cor.* 5.11. *If any that is called a brother, be a fornicatour, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, &c.* This our dissenting brethren will not deny to be meant of Christians, therefore their children are to be baptized.

Sixthly, Those children that are holy by reason of birth from one or both beleeving parents, are to be baptized: But the children of those that are in sin may be holy by reason of birth of one, or both beleeving parents, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. To clear this place, which some weakly enough, have urged for the contrary. Let us enquire who the Apostle means by a Beleever, and who he means by an unbeliever, and this will soone be decided; if we look to the case propounded by letter from the Corinthians, which he there resolves, and answers their scruples; That is confest to be marriage between a Christian and a Heathen a professed Believer and an Infidel, a man removed from an Infidel, (to take upon him the name of Christ), is there a Beleever, and many of these even in *Corinth*, were men in sinne. They that will have the Beleever there to set out only a justified and sanctified person, they must by unbeleever mean all unsanctified persons, and so the case propounded and satisfied, is, whether a regenerate person sanctified by the Spirit, married to one that gives not full, or at least hopeful evidences of sanctification, may continue a marriage-society? whether a man of *Jobs* integrity might have lived with such a wife to whom *Job* was joyned? a thing that was never yet brought into question, either by Jew or Christian; and altogether unworthy of an Apostles determination. The thing is plaine, that as infants have right to Baptisme, so all the infants of those parents that *nomine tenus* are Christians, have right to Baptism. See more, *Treatise of the Sacraments, page* 161. Amplification of this position.

To amplifie this in some particulars, and if it may be, to make it more clear to doubting Christians.

First, A life in distrust of God, and rebellion against God, provo-

king him to the highest punishment of the parents, doth not divest the child of the title to the covenant, and interest in the Sacrament of initiation into the number of Christians. For proof of this, look upon that act of *Joshua*, when the people were got out of the Wilderneſſe, and were brought into the Land of *Canaan*, Josh. 5. 6, 7. *The children of* Israel *walked fourty yeers in the Wilderneſſe, till all the people that were men of warre that came out of* Egypt *were consumed, because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord; And the children which he raised up in their stead, them did* Joshua *circumcise, for they were uncircumcised, they had not circumcised them in the way*; you see what the fathers were, yet the children *Joshua* ordered to be circumcised; Concerning their conversation, the parents were enemies, but as touching the election, the choice made of God, the issue is to be numbred among the beloved. Who had a worse father than *Josiah*, yet where was there a better son? A circumcised man, who in youth began *to seek the God of his father* David, 2 *Chron.* 34. 3.

Secondly, Misbelief in a parent divests not the issue of this birth-priviledge; though the father erre in the faith, yet the child is not to be shut out of the number of beleevers. We have in this particular the Apostle for a precedent, had misbelief in the parent denuded the childe of this priviledge. Saint *Paul* had not beene a *Jew by nature*, but an Heretick, or Sectary by nature, being before conversion a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee; Scribe was a name of office, but Pharisee the name of a Sect, and therefore Christ warns to beware of the leaven, that is, of the Doctrine of the Pharisees, as of the Sadduces; Such was *Pauls* parentage, and yet by descent and off-spring, he is of the people of the Jewes. What we say of Pharisees, is as true of Sadduces; It is not to be doubted but they were circumcised persons, and entitled their children according to the Directory in Scripture for circumcision, as appears by their embodying of themselves with the people of the Jewes, *Matth.* 22. 23. *Acts* 23. 6. The most strict of Pharisees took them into their society, which they had not done, had they not been men of the circumcision, we see the accusation charged on *Peter* on this occasion, *Acts* 11. 2, 3. A man transmits not his errors, nor his vices no more than he doth his graces.

Thirdly, ignorance of needful truths, in a parent doth not divest

vest the childe of this priviledge. Those were the people of God (and therefore brought forth children to God) that did perish for lack of knowledge, *Hosea* 4.6. that went into captivity for lack of knowledge, *Isa.* 5. A reverend brother, giving his reasons why he is among his brethren singular in this point, not baptizing all born in his Parish; one maine one is, the grosse ignorance among them, and that (as he sayes) *not in Cumberland, and those parts, but in Essex, such, that if he should print, his Reader would scarce beleeve it were possible to be true*; To which I only say, I wish that our own experience in the places where we live, did give us occasion of suspition, that any wrong is done them. Therefore to let the truth passe unquestioned, I would only wish him to consider, whether there might not have been found the like in *Corinth*, that Church of the Saints, 1 *Cor.*15.34. *Some have not the knowledge of God, I speak this to your shame.* Whether there he might not have found the like among the illuminated Hebrews, were not there those that were *dull of hearing, that when for the time they ought to be teachers, they had need that one teach them againe, which be the first principles of the Oracles of God, and were become such as had need of milke, and not of strong meat?* yet these were of the Church, and therefore with them their children.

Fourthly, illegitimation of birth, adulterous copulation in the parents, divesteth not such issue of this priviledge, *David* had never in that manner sought in fasting and prayer his childes life, had he believed that he must not have been of the seed of the Jews, but of the uncircumcised Heathen; *Pharez* was of such a birth, yet who bore a greater name and glory in *Israel* than he, and his family? even where the illegitimation of his birth is noted, there the glory of his race is magnified, which is yet farther honoured in that Christ according to the flesh was made of his seed. That seed of *Abraham per eminentiam*, was out of his loynes; *Jephtah* indeed was driven out by his brethren, but not because that he was not of the seed of the Jews, and people of God, but because they would not have him to share of the inheritance among them.

Objections answered.

A Reverend Divine saith, *That some persons may be notorious offenders (as known Atheists, mockers of Religion, Idolaters, Papists, Heretricks, Witches) and yet professe before men the faith, seemes to him to imply a contradiction.* These (I confesse) are plausible

ſible words to take with well-meaning ſouls, that attend not to the language of the Scripture in this particular. And for the firſt, if he meanes *Atheiſts* in judgement, that profeſſedly maintaine in word, what *Davids* fool ſaid in his heart, *that there is no God*, and by mockers of Religion, not thoſe alone that oppoſe the power, but with *Lucian*, all notion of Religion; and by Idolaters, thoſe that profeſſedly worſhip falſe gods, and worſhip not at all the Lord Jehovah, then it cannot be denied that this is a contradiction: But Reverend Maſter *Rutherford*, whom he oppoſeth in that place, hath no ſuch meaning; But for an Atheiſt in life, to be a profeſſour of the faith, we have *Paul* expreſſely for it, *Titus* 1. 16. *They profeſſe that they know God, but in works they deny him, being abominable, and diſobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.* The Apoſtle (we ſee) ſaw no contradiction in it; and for mockers of Religion, *Peter* did not foretell them to be out of the Church, but within the boſome of it, when he ſaid, *There ſhall come in the laſt dayes ſcoffers, walking after their own luſts*, 2 Pet. 3, 3. For Idolaters, if an Iſraelite might be an Idolater, then a Chriſtian; How high were thoſe in Idolatry mentioned, *Pſal.* 106. 36, 37, 38, 39? and yet in covenant, *ver.* 45. For the Church of *Corinth* the Apoſtle is plaine, A brother may be an Idolater, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. It is within the Church, and not without, where men eſcape death by plagues. *yet repent not of the works of their hands, that they ſhould not worſhip Devils, and Idols of gold, and ſilver, and braſſe, and ſtone, and of wood, which neither can ſee, nor heare, nor walke*, Rev 9. 20. For Papiſts, I marvel how they are diſtinguiſhed from Idolaters and Hereticks; for Hereticks as falſe Prophets were of the Church of the Jewes, ſo Hereticks are of the Church in Goſpel-times, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. The Apoſtle tells the Elders of *Epheſus*, Acts 20. 30. *Of your own ſelves ſhall men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw away Diſciples after them.* For Witches, though there were a Law in *Iſrael* not to ſuffer a Witch to live, *Exod.* 22. 18. yet *Iſrael* had Witches, as is ſeen in thoſe that *Saul* put out of the Land, and her that in his diſtreſſe he ſought unto, 1 *Sam.* 28. *Paul* had never reckoned up witchcraft among thoſe ſinnes that ſhut out of the Kingdome of heaven, and certified the Churches of *Galatia* of it, had there been an impoſſibility that any ſuch ſhould be found of their number that made claime to it; This the Reverend Authour doth as much

much as acknowledge in the words that follow, *I deny not* (saith he) *but that in some sense, any such notorious offendor may have the essence and being of a member of the Church as visible, to wit, in this sense a corrupt and rotten member fit to be cut off. A member of the visible Church, (though formerly an inoffensive professor of the faith) may afterwards fall away into any of these notorious scandals, and yet for a while still retain the essence and being of a member of the Church as visible.* Master *Rutherford* that is there opposed (I suppose) will affirme no more, Respective to the power of godlinesse, there is in them no soundnesse, nor yet in those that are better than these; Some say *that one that is such in any known foule sinne, to them is no better than a Heathen, as bad as a Turke, or Pagan, and nothing at all better for the name Christian.* And I say, that to me they are as bad, as to them, and perhaps worse in the eyes of God. This priviledge in which they stand thus interessed, is an aggravation of their sinne, and a farther provocation of God against them; *When the Lord saw it, he abhorred them, because of the provoking of his sonnes and of his daughters,* Deut. 32. 19. yet such is Gods long-suffering, and forbearance of them, that he is pleased to vouchsafe them farther and more large evidences of his favour, *Nehem.* 9. 30. Hierusalem *was corrupted more than* Sodom *and* Samaria, *in all her wayes,* Ezek. 16. 47. Sodom *and her daughters, had not done as* Hierusalem *and her daughters,* ver. 48. Samaria *had not committed halfe her sinnes,* ver. 51. In her abominations she had justified both of them; yet *Hierusalem* enjoyed those priviledges, that *Samaria* and *Sodom* enjoyed not; *Hierusalem* was in covenant, *ver.* 16. when *Sodom* and *Samaria* were no covenant-people, but worshipped they knew not what, *John* 4. *ver.* 22. *Corazin* and *Bethsaida,* Cities of *Israel,* were no better in the eye of God than *Tyre* and *Sidon*, yea their sinnes deserved an heavier weight of judgement, *Matth.* 11. 22. *It shall be more tolerable for* Tyre *and* Sydon *at the day of judgement, than for you,* saith our Saviour; and so it was with *Capernaum,* compared to *Sodom,* ver. 23. yet *Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum,* enjoyed those priviledges from God, that *Tyre, Sidon* and *Sodom* wanted. As the Apostles zeal against the Samaritanes sinnes, *Luke* 9. 54. did out-strip our Saviours, when they would have fire from heaven to consume them; so our zeale out-goes Gods, when we would have such

men, root and branch, parent and child ſtruck out of covenant, before God hath ſued out any Bill of divorce againſt them, or removed his Candleſtick, and taken all covenant-priviledges from them. For the baptiſm of children of Apoſtates, there is a greater difficulty. Some of reverend worth ſay, *They ſee not how juſtly a Parents Apoſtaſy ſhould deprive the childe of Baptiſme*, and ſome Texts of Scripture ſeem ſtrongly to favour that opinion, *Ezek.* 16.20,21. *Moreover, thou haſt taken thy ſonnes and thy daughters whom thou haſt borne unto me, and theſe haſt thou ſacrificed unto them to be devoured; Is this of thy whoredomes a ſmall matter, that thou haſt ſlain my children, and delivered them, to cauſe them to paſſe through the fire for them?*

There could not be an higher evidence of Apoſtacy, than to give their children in ſacrifice to a falſe god. It was one of the higheſt acts of obedience that *Abraham* could teſtifie to the Lord, and yet theſe yield it to Idol-gods; *They bring forth children to God, and give them to* Moloch, *Pſal.* 106. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39. *They were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works, and they ſerved their Idols, which were a ſnare unto them, yea they ſacrificed their ſons and daughters unto devils. And ſhed innocent blood, even the blood of their ſonnes and of their daughters, whom they ſacrificed unto the Idols of* Canaan, *and the land was polluted with blood. Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a whoring with their own inventions.* Theſe in this apoſtatized from God in covenant, yet God lookes upon them as a covenant-people, *ver.* 45. *And he remembred for them his covenant, &c.* But this ſeemes to be but a partial Apoſtaſy, taking in the worſhip of Idols, they did not totally caſt off the worſhip of God. A line of profeſſion was ſtill (it ſeemes) held up, God was not wholly caſt off in *Judah*. They ſeem to be of thoſe, *that ſwore by the Lord and* Malcham, *Zeph.* 1. 5. keeping up the worſhip of the true God, and yet take in the worſhip of a falſe god with him. As for thoſe in whom Maſter *Firmin* inſtanceth; our Engliſhmen now in *Turkey*, apoſtatized from the Faith to that Religion; concerning whom quæres are often put, it may ſeem equal, that as a man comes into covenant, and his poſterity with him; *So*, totally rejecting the covenant, denying God as well in profeſſion, as in his works; that he and his poſterity ſhould be out of covenant; Being before an holy root, to tranſmit holineſſe to his

ſeed,

seed, now he becomes unholy, and put out of such capacity, and is disabled from making over any such priviledge to them. But here we need not to trouble our selves with the Baptisme of such, having renounced Christ, they baptize not their infants in his name. A Minister shall have none of these tendered to him, and to baptize them into this body, when he well knowes they must be never suffered to be of it, were an high taking of Gods name in vaine, and a mockery of so sacred an Ordinance. Now in case a grandfather shall take one of these children, and offer it unto Baptisme; and being a Progenitor, shall undertake the education in the Christian Faith, and not in the Turkish abomination, whether in this case there be right to Baptisme, is the question. Now these may be looked upon, either as meer Heathens, in the same condition, as if they never had an Ancestor in the Faith, or else as issuing out of the loynes of mediate Ancestors, believing, and so coming from a root that hath been holy. If considered in the former way, they may have a title to Baptisme according to many eminent Divines, by vertue of their Adoption. Reverend Master *Cawdrey* observes a three-fold way to circumcision from *Gen.* 17. *One is personal upon profession of Faith in a mans own person*, so *Abraham* entered. *A second is paternal, when a man comes in by right derived from his Parents*, so *Isaac* and *Ishmael* had title. *A third, adoptive, being taken into the family of a Beleever according to that*, Gen. 17. 12, 13. *He that is eight dayes old among you, shall be circumcised, every man-childe in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed. He that is borne in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, &c.* Any bondman that he would take, and adopt into his family, in such case had right of circumcision: *Rivet.* on *Gen.* 17. *Exercit.* 85. is cleare of this judgement, and sayes, he remembers that it was so determined in the National Synods of the *French* Churches, quoting in like manner *Prosper* in his second Book, *De vocatione gentium*, Chap. 8. a *Sometimes this priviledge is vouchsafed to the children of Infidels, when by a secret providence they into the hands of the godly.* Master *Cotton* I remember in his book of Infant-Baptisme is for it. Master *Norton* against *Apollonius* for present suspends his judgement, *page* 38. I had rather

a *Aliquando filiis infidelium præstatur hæc gratia ut baptizentur cùm occultâ Dei providentiâ in manus piorum quomodocunque proveniunt.*

ther go his way, than theirs that determine it; and in my thoughts with ſubmiſſion to better judgements, I rather incline in preſent to the contrary. Thoſe that *Abraham* bought with his money, I ſuppoſe were men of years, who were to be circumciſed and their iſſue; But whether they were not firſt inſtructed, is the queſtion. No uncircumciſed perſon was to be in his houſe, and whether he might compel to circumciſion may well be diſputed. He found them explicitely in covenant with falſe gods, and whether he might give them the ſeale of the covenant of the true God in that ſtate, I queſtion. It is ſaid, *Gods covenant ſhall be in their fleſh*, verſe 13. and that this ſhould be done, and no covenant with the true God at all profeſſedly in their mouth, no notion of him by way of aſſent in their heart, to me is ſtrange; I think it implies *Abrahams* work, firſt in inſtructing of them in the covenant, and upon their aſſent they were received, and their ſeed with them. Circumciſion did denominate them a people of God, and that is a ſtrong contradiction to have them circumciſed, whoſe faith was in a falſe god, and who applied themſelves to ſuch worſhip; Their entrance I ſhould rather take to be perſonal, than adoptive. Conſider them then as deſcending from the loynes of Chriſtian progenitors, having fathers of their fleſh heretofore in covenant with God, and we ſhall finde them in a better condition than thoſe Heathens that had ever been ſtrangers. And here the Apoſtle will help us to a diſtinction, *Rom.* 11. 28. Speaking of the Jewes cut off from the body of the Church viſible. *As concerning the Goſpel*, (ſaith he) *they are enemies for your ſakes.* Their preſent condition is as Heathens, being alienated from God by reaſon of unbelief of the Goſpel (which Apoſtaſy of theirs hath given occaſion to, and made way for the calling of the Gentiles:) *But as touching the Election, they are friends*, ſaith he; God hath reſpect to them, not totally to reject them *for their fathers ſake*; for the covenant which he entered with, and the love that he ſhewed unto thetr fore-fathers, being beloved upon the account of their fathers; When there is a father found to do them that office, to take them out of the wild Olive, to put them into the true Olive; I do not doubt, but that they

have

have title: Though Baptisme should be denied to infants respective to all predecessors, pure Heathen (notwithstanding Adoption, which I will not determine) yet the Apostle speaking so much in favour of Jewes, even in their state of blindnesse, respective to the hope of their future call; I do not doubt but it might be vouchsafed (upon this account of Adoption) to an infant-Jew, if we can have any ground fairely to conclude his descent from *Abraham*, much more where we can easily evidence a descent from parents that are Christian. And this I hope is some explication of my meaning where in answer to the demand of an adversary I say, *That infants be capable of Baptism, by descent from parents, either within mans memory, or beyond it; when a line of profession holds, or is againe restored, that the infants may be received into the visible Church, and enjoy the saving Ordinances of Christ Jesus*, page 68. of my answer; and some satisfaction to the question concerning the power of mediate Parents, giving title to Baptisme, where out of the case of total Apostasy there is small difficulty. I shall conclude in the words of *Rivet.* a *If a parent wants true Faith, yet makes profession of it, and in the external society of the Church is accounted a Beleever, or hath been accounted heretofore under the Old Testament; the infants borne of such parents, are in covenant with them, and partakers of the promise, even upon this account; because the promise was received of the Ancestors in behalfe of the posterity that should issue from them; which the unbelief or hypocrisie of the immediate parent, cannot make invalid as long as the infant cannot imitate the unbelief or hypocrisie of the parent.*

a *Si Parens carens verâ fide, eam tamen profiteatur & in externo Ecclesiæ cœtu pro fideli habeatur, aut olim habitus fuerit sub veteri Testamento infantes ex talibus nascentes erant fœderati & promissionis participes; quia etiam promissio acceptata fuerit, à parentibus majoribus in gratiam nascituræ posteritatis cui non præjudicat immediati Parentis incredulitas aut hypocrisis quamdiu infans incredulitatem & hypocrisin Parentis imitari non potest.* Rivet. *in* Gen. Cap. 17. Exercit. 88.

CHAP. LIX.

A Defence of the former Doctrine reſpective to the latitude of Infant-Baptiſme.

A Reverend Authour putting it to the Queſtion, *Whether the Miniſters of* England *are bound by the Word of God to baptize the children which ſay they beleeve in Jeſus Chriſt, but are groſſely ignorant, ſcandalous in their converſations, ſcoffers at godlineſſe, and refuſe to ſubmit at Church-diſcipline?* determining it in the negative, a work moſt candidly carried on, muſt be ingeniouſly acknowledged, yet a work in which the Authour appears rather diffident, than confident, more in ſuſpition, than aſſured of the verity of his own tenent, or warranty of his preſent practice. Sometimes he confeſſes himſelf at a diſadvantage, and comes very weakly off it, *page* 13. Sometimes he calls for better fingers to untie the knot that he meets with, *page* 32. Sometimes he even yeelds all, as the ſtate did ſtand not onely with the Jewes, but alſo as it doth ſtand with us, though it ought *de jure* to be otherwiſe, *page* 34. Sometimes he profeſſes not to deny any infants, but to delay them, *page* 42. Sometimes he ſayes he had rather grapple with thoſe, who think he is too large, than with thoſe who judge him to be too ſtreight, *page* 43. Suſpecting his errour (as indeed it doth) if Scripture may determine) to lie on that hand. I ſhall as briefly as may be take a view of it. He premiſes two things, *page* 1, 2. for the clearing of the queſtion,

Firſt, Premiſes two grounds, on which he builds his diſcourſe; 2. Puts the Queſtion as above; 3. Brings arguments for the negative, which I ſhall here take into conſideration.

Firſt, *The infant that is to be baptized, if we conſider it in it ſelf as abſtracted from the parent, gives no reaſon for it ſelfe why it ſhould be baptized.* This we willingly yield, the infant hath no independent title, the right claimed is in relation to the parents, and thence I inferre the infants right is ſomewhat, that parents can tranſmit to their children that gives the title, otherwiſe they might have regeneration from parents, as well as Baptiſme. It is not then inherent graces that we muſt look after, reſpective to

the

the childes intereſt, but covenant-priviledge, covenant-holineſſe.

A ſecond ground is inferred from the former. *All children then* (ſaith he) *are baptized by vertue of the parent, one or both, ever conſidering the childe in relation to the parent, being the branch of ſuch a root, and ſo I take in the childe together with the parent. Hence we ſay commonly, they muſt be children borne in the Church, that is, of ſuch parents as are members of the Church, being a ſociety of viſible Saints joyned together, by way of covenant, to exerciſe an holy communion with God in Chriſt, and ſo one with another, according to the order of the Goſpel: for I preſume none are ſo ſottiſh to underſtand a Church to be that place which by a Metonymy of the ſubject we call a Church, nor the Pariſhes that men live in which never were of Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution.* I am utterly to ſeek what is meant by that place, which by a Metonymy of the ſubject we call a Church: our meeting places ſeeme to be intended, but few children are borne there; and the Authour ſpeaks of a Church where children are borne. For the covenant of which he ſpeaks one with another, according to the order of the Goſpel, which he ſeemes to underſtand of a Congregational Church, conſtituting covenant, and puts into the definition of a Church; this ſhould not have been premiſed, but proved. His adverſaries in this thing, know no ſuch explicite covenant. If an implicite one will ſerve, then the Pariſh-inhabitants (which he ſayes were never of Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution) are all in covenant; Men that profeſſe God in Chriſt, and by vertue of conveniency of habitation, joyne in one, in the worſhip of God, in the uſe of Ordinances, tacitely and implicitely are in covenant together, and we take it to be no ſottiſh thing to eſteeme theſe as Churches. If this be his meaning, to aſſert onely an implicite covenant, where he ſayes page 3. (*This rule warrants any Miniſter comfortably to adminiſter that Ordinance. Here is a parent, one or both viſibly in covenant with God, and a viſible member of Chriſts Church; I do therefore adminiſter the ſeal of the covenant unto this infant by vertue of this parent, according to that Command given to* Abraham, *the father of believers, with whom when the Lord entered into covenant, and laid the foundation of the Church viſible in his family, he took his ſeed into covenant with him, and commanded that they with him ſhould keep that*

Covenant of Church-members either explicite or implicite.

Seale of his covenant,) we freely conſent, and then the queſtion is determined in the affirmative; I am ſure the Church of the Jewes took in ſuch by circumciſion, that ſome would exclude from Baptiſme. In caſe he meanes an explicite Church-covenant, over and above the covenant of grace, as the Jewes had no ſuch way, ſo neither had the Apoſtles or primitive Chriſtians. Thoſe converts, *Acts* 2. did not that firſt day of their converſion before their Baptiſme ſet up Congregational Churches with officers, they dwelt in many remote places at great diſtance (whither they were to returne to their reſpective families,) and therefore could not in this way embody themſelves, in one diſtinct ſociety for exerciſe of diſcipline. Aſſoon as the Eunuch by *Philips* preaching of a Jewiſh proſelyte, is made a Chriſtian Diſciple, he ſaith to *Philip*, *See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?* Acts 8. 36. Had *Philip* underſtood a neceſſity of confederation into a Church-way, over and above the covenant of grace before Baptiſme, he had doubtleſſe informed him; and as Chriſt ſent the Leper that he had cleanſed, to *ſhew himſelfe to the Prieſt, and offer the gift that* Moſes *had Commanded*, Matth. 8. 4. ſo *Philip* would have obſerved the Goſpel-order appointed, and have ſent him to ſome particular conſtituted viſible Church, upon his covenant to have been received, and not hand over head, upon his bare profeſſion *that he beleeved that Jeſus Chriſt is the Sonne of God*, baptized him. When the Gentiles had received the Holy Ghoſt, *Peter* ſaid, *Acts* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* had there been any ſuch rule of a Church-covenant, orderly to have preceded, he might eaſily have ſeen that any man, upon that account might have forbidden it. *Paul* had made much more haſte (as I may ſay) than good ſpeed, *Acts* 16. In baptizing the Jaylour and his houſhold, in caſe Jeſus had ſet down an order of a preconfederation into a particular Church-ſociety. Maſter *Bartlet* in his model of the Congregational way, ſaith, *that thoſe particular inſtances which are produced by divers reverend Divines, of the Eunuch, Centurions, Jaylours Baptiſme, though not belonging to any particular Church againſt what we have laid down, are of little force and validity, in regard that which was done to thoſe perſons was by the hands of extraordinary officers, that were not tied to particular Churches*

The Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians knew no explicite Church-Covenant,

Churches, as ordinary Paſtours and Teachers were then, and ſtill are. But theſe perſons whom they thus baptized, were not perſons in any ſuch extraordinary capacity, and they muſt come in, in a Goſpel-way. This might have priviledged the Leper cleanſed by Chriſt, from offering his gift appointed by *Moſes*, as well as it could priviledge theſe new Converts from any covenant-way appointed by Chriſt; and the Eunuch ſaith, *What doth hinder me to be baptized?* without mention of any ſpecial priviledge of an officer extraordinary, in a way otherwiſe irregular. And the like we may obſerve in the ſpeech of *Peter*. (2.) They ſhould ſhew us where, when, and by what authority, any ordinary Paſtours and Teachers tied themſelves to ſuch an order, to bring men into a Congregational Church-way, and to baptize into ſuch particular Church Congregational, and not into the univerſal Church viſible. (3.) Thoſe of his judgement, may do well to give us their thoughts of their own Baptiſme. They had no independant right, all their right was in relation to their parents. Their parents were not (as we conceive) thus in any particular Church federation, perhaps they were no fit perſons in their judgement for admiſſion, neither were they baptized by the hands of extraordinary Officers. If their Baptiſme was null, then they are yet to be baptized; if valid, they had then title to Baptiſme, and others in their condition are entitled. (4.) Then it is in the power of man, at pleaſure to keep parent and childe from the priviledge of Ordinances, to have them paſſe as Heathens and Infidels, yea believing godly men and their children at their courteſie, muſt be reputed either of the number of dogges or of children, this cannot be denied. The majority of theſe have power at pleaſure of admiſſion of members. And to be no Church-member (with them) is the ſame as to be a Turke, or Indian, *page 9.* And how different their judgements are, who are fit to be received, and who are to be denied, is evident. Some of no obſcure note have affirmed, though minded, be contrary minded, *that to render a man capable of admiſſion into Church-memberſhip, grace is not ſufficient, but he muſt have expreſſions*, and ſo a fathers ſlow tongue, ſhall exclude his childe from admittance into the fellowſhip of the Saints; when upon the other hand upon the bare account of his fathers glib tongue, (though there be ſcarce another commendable quality) another may be received,

when theſe are not judged worthy of fellowſhip, who are not of abilities to ſit in judgemeut with the Congregation, to admit members, to paſſe ſentence upon delinquents, to judge of Doctrines, not only to elect, but to ordain Paſtours and Church-Officers, we may eaſily gueſſe how many they exclude as without, whom Chriſt receives. Such a way had it been taken, had deprived the Church of an *Hezekiah*, *Joſiah*, and many others in their age renowned; How great a provocation is this to ſuch children when once of growth to joyne with them with whom the Church rancks them? and to oppoſe with the uttermoſt of fury, ſuch that (after the revolution of ſo many generations inheriting that priviledge) now do debarre them? And how great an encouragement to joyne with ſuch in all holineſſe, with whom they are honoured with theſe priviledges?

As to the ſecond, whether the Miniſters of *England* are bound by the Word of God to baptize their children which ſay they beleeve in Jeſus Chriſt, but are groſſely ignorant, ſcandalous in their converſations, ſcoffers at godlineſſe, and refuſe to ſubmit to Church-Diſcipline. Our Authour puts a Queſtion, *What parent do you mean; the immediate parent onely, or the predeceſſors? For ſuppoſe the immediate parent be as your queſtion mentions; yet it may be the Grand-father, or ſome of the predeceſſors have been godly.* And farther ſayes, *I perceive diverſe of our Divines help themſelves here, and ſome in diſcourſe are content to loſe that ground of the immediate parent, and flie to this.* Though I ſee no reaſon that any ſhould fly hither, in hope of help, yet it is ſtrange to me that he ſhould ſtand for the immediate parent, excluding all mediate predeceſſours, who hath ſaid enough for their power in giving of this intereſt to the children. He ſayes, *I do adminiſter the Seale of the covenant unto this childe by vertue of this parent, according to that Command given to* Abraham, *the father of Beleevers, with whom when the Lord entered into covenant, and laid the foundation of the Church viſible in his family, he took his ſeed into covenant with him, and commanded that with him they ſhould keepe that Seale of his covenant,* When God tooke *Abraham* into covenant and his ſeed with him, it was not onely his immediate ſeed, but the iſſue of his fleſh at the greateſt diſtance, Gods covenant with *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, is mentioned in

Gods

Gods apparition to *Moses*, *Exod.* 3. 6. and was pleaded by *Moses* in his intercession with God for *Israel*, Exod. 32. 13. *Moses* then, and all *Israel* were in this confederation of *Abraham*, yea all *Israel* in succeeding ages, *Levit.* 26. 42. When the worst of Jewes make that plea, that they are *Abrahams* seed, the Lord Christ yields it, *John* 8. 37. and the Apostle concludes a holinesse in the whole body upon that account, that the root at such a distance, *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, were holy, *Rom.* 11. 16. I know not how we can bottome any thing upon the grand Charter of God, made to *Abraham*, and exclude the mediate parent from all power to conferre this interest upon posterity. When *Jacob* calls *Ephraim* and *Manasseh* by the name of sonnes. *Gen.* 48. 9. as a father gives his blessing to them, putting his name, and the names of his fathers, *Abraham* and *Isaac* upon them, *ver.* 16. and 20. were they not to be reckoned for the sonnes and seed of *Jacob*? doth not their mediate Parent, as well as *Joseph* their immediate father, conferre an interest on them? Mr. *Hooker* was before our Authour in this tenent, and his grounds are fully answered by Mr. *Caudrey*, in his *Diatribe*, concerning infant-baptisme. I shall onely take into consideration our Authors Reasons.

Mr. *Firmins* reasons and his replies to them.

1.

First, he yields that *England had Christians in Primitive-times. Thousands of Martyrs under* Diocletian, *but after the waters grew brackish at* Rome, and brings it to us in *England; we held* (saith he) *the name Christianity under the* Romish *yoke, till of late the State threw it off, and then the people following the State concluding, I doubt not but God had his number in those dark times; but what were those few in comparison of the body of the people, or predecessours, since the time of the Gospel restored to its purity; God hath wonderfully appeared in* England; *but those who use the argument of predecessours runne very high.*

Answ. 1. If the waters grew brackish at *Rome*, so that they gave their sent hither; so did the waters of *Judea* and *Jernsalem* grow as brackish, yea, and of a worser savour in the dayes of *Ahaz*; and at those times when they brought forth children to God and gave them to *Moloch*, *Ezek.* 16. 20.

2. Neither do we look so farre back (when we look back as farre as *Diocletian*) as the Jewes in Christs time; as *Paul* that looked

looked as farre as *Abraham* in his time; yea, himſelf ſtayes not till he come up to him, we are not neceſſitated to look ſo high. A pedigree in a ſhorter line as to this purpoſe will ſerve our turne; we are not tied to make it out that our Progenitors were really godly, to conferre ſuch covenant-intereſt upon us. Primitive-Chriſtians were admitted upon the accouut of Profeſſion, by our Authours confeſſion, and not upon the account of reality of godlineſſe, and they gave their poſterity intereſt. We ſee how much reverend Maſter *Hooker* ſpeaking the opinion of his party, gives to the Churches connivance, negligence, or indulgence in this thing: *If the Church* (ſaith he) *either through connivance, negligence, or indulgence ſhall tolerate ſuch evils, and evil perſons in that ſtate of Church-memberſhip, they cannot then deny them the priviledge of Members.* And I dare attribute as much to Gods connivance, his indulgence, and long-ſuffering; Till he ſue out a bill of divorce, and openly caſts a people off, (that they be none of his Kingdome, or called by his name,) they are in covenant, and their children with them. It ſeems Maſter *Hooker* judges that the Church may thus connive without ſinne; ſeeing he diſtinguiſheth between connivance, indulgence, and negligence. I am ſure God may, out of juſt prerogative; And to have the line broken off, aſſoon as the power of godlineſſe, in a race declines, is to be infinitely above God, rigorous, and ſevere, and the ready way to bring in a ſtrange and monſtrous confuſion. He goes on, and ſayes *he will a little conſider the Text in reference to them*; and then inſtances in that in the ſecond Commandment, *ſhewing mercy unto thouſands, of them that love me, and keep my Commandments*, as though that were the alone Text we had, to reſt upon. Though much might be ſpoke by way of Animadverſion of his Anſwer, yet I forbeare. Uſe may be made of that Text, to evidence that it is no unreaſonable thing to carry on a priviledge ſo farre, from generation to generation, and an eaſie reply made to moſt that he hath ſpoken; Yet I build not a formal Argument upon it, therefore I ſhall not ſpend time in it. His ſecond, third and fourth Argument come in to fill up his Comment on that Text, and therefore might have been anſwers, not Arguments. 2, 3, 4.

Fifthly, he ſayes, *that Text*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *ſeemes to tie the federal* 5.

federal holinesse of the childe to the immediate parent; doth not say, the child is holy, &c. by vertue of a great grandfather: And so it seemes to me also. Those *Corinthians* being new Converts, their issue had none but immediate Parents, from whom they might claime their interest; and by whom they might be entitled, As the Parents themselves did claime it from no Parents or Progenitours at all, their Ancestours having no power to communicate it; *Isaac* and *Ishmael* had right of circumcision onely from their immediate Parent; *Abraham* had right immediately from God, *Jacob* and his posterity had right from Parents, both mediate and immediate, and these *Corinthians* from their immediate Parents onely, and their children from Parents mediate and immediate.

Sixthly, He sayes. *If that promise doth give this power to predecessours, &c. then though there are none to educate this childe, (For the ignorant profane parents will not but teach them how to break the covenant; The predecessours cannot, they are dead, and are not;) yet we must seale to this childe, &c. Where do you see Churches take care of such children? they must be of some bigenesse, and understanding before the Church meddle with them; the immediate profane person brings him up in ignorance and profaneneſſe, neither will take care to have his childe instructed by the Church, as experience witnesseth too much? Answ.* I understand here the covenant-promise, as *Acts* 2. 39. by vertue of which these Jewes were children of the covenant *Acts* 2. 35. and not with limit to the second Commandment; and then speak to it. 6.

1. Here is enough spoke to conclude the childes interest, in case he shall be taught to break covenant, then he is in covenant. An *Indians* childe breaks no covenant with God; And being in covenant, he is interessed in the priviledge of the covenant.

2. Let him make it up into a formal Argument, and then it runnes thus. That childe whose immediate Parents will not bring it up in the power of godlinesse, hath no right to Baptism. This, though it carry some fair shew, with those that are not able to judge; yet it is evidently false, Those that were *witnesse to themselves, that they were the children of those that killed the Prophets, were of the circumcision*, Matth. 23. 31. yea, those that had cru-

cified Chriſt, were in covenant with God, and their children in confederation, *Acts* 2. 39. That counſel of the Prophet, *Zach.* 1.4. *Be ye not as your fathers, unto whom the former Prophets have cryed, ſaying, Thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, Turne ye now from your evil wayes, and your evil doings, &c.* might have been ſpared, in caſe none had been received as Members in covenant; but thoſe whoſe fathers took all care for their education in the power of godlineſſe, and *Stephen* might have ſpared his reproof, *Acts* 7. 51, 52, 53. or rather had runne upon a contradiction when he ſaid, *Ye ſtiffe-necked, and uncircumciſed in hearts and eares, ye do alwayes reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt as your fathers did, ſo do ye. Which of the Prophets have not your fathers perſecuted? and they have ſlaine them which ſhewed before of the coming of the juſt One, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers; who have received the Law by the diſpoſition of Angels, and have not kept it.* They ſtood veſted with their children in that great prerogative, *Rom.* 3. 1. The caſe of ſuch children is ſad, but not deſperate: Though the Church cannot do the whole duty incumbent on a godly Parent, yet it takes care for the diſpenſation of thoſe Ordinances that are ſaving, and Scripture calls by the name of Salvation. I know ſome ſeeing the truth of title in ſuch children to the covenant, and conſequently to Baptiſme, and therefore dare not deny them; yet are ſo farre ſcandalized with this looſe education of children, that they will admit it onely with this caution, that ſome undertake for their education; and ſo thoſe of looſe life, may have their children baptized; *becauſe* (ſay they) *ſome difference ought to be put in all divine Ordinances, between the pure and impure for the comfort of the godly, the cenſure of the wicked, and the edification of all.* But I wonder how this difference of pure and impure is ſeen between childe and childe, that is tendered to Baptiſm. As to covenant-holineſſe they are both equal, otherwiſe theſe mens undertakings would very hardly give them admiſſion; and as to real-holineſſe, neither have it, by communication from their Parents; *otherwiſe* (ſay they) *the Ordinances of God cannot be kept without blot and pollution.* I wonder what pollution theſe mean; I know none in children but Original ſin, and the childe of the beſt Parents is tainted with it; and let us take heed of buſying our ſelves with more care for preſervation of Ordinances, than ever God himſelf took about them. If theſe, thus borne, have

have no right at all, (I suppose) they should not be admitted with any caution whatsoever. Master *Cawdry* observes (and seemes to be of that judgement,) that some think this proviso to be too hard: I confesse, I am of that minde; If (notwithstanding so sad discomforts in such Parents) infants stand vested in any such Birth-right-priviledge; why should it be suspended on the courtesie of such undertakers? being by birth-interest Christians, they must not on this account passe for Heathens. And how hard is it to impose such a burden upon any that is not ready to adopt the issue as his owne? and in such case, his undertaking upon that ground brings the charge of a father upon him. This will soone grow into the bare formality of former Suscetors, God-fathers, and God-mothers, without any real advantage to the childe. If by education be meant, such as a godly Parent ought to give, none will be found to do it. If onely education in the way of a Christian, as in opposition to Judaisme, Heatheniſme, it needs not to be doubted, and that implies a covenant. What farther is desired, must be left to the blessing of God, by providence on Ordinances. The want of piety in the Parent is supplied by the piety of the Church, into which the infant is received.

Seventhly, saith he. *If the Predecessour may by this promise give right to Baptisme, without the immediate Parent; then I pray you tell us how farre we may go for this Predecessour? how many generations? Where hath Gods Word limited Ministers, you may go to this Predecessour, and no farther?* 1. I know few that say the Predecessour gives right, without the immediate Parent, but all concurre in a joynt way to communicate a covenant-interest; but his question may have an easie answer. 7.

2. I demand in titles of Honour, and inheritance of Lands, which men claime by descent from their Ancestors, where it is that they stay? It will be soon answered that they stay, when they can rise no higher, to finde any other Predecessours vested in such honours, or such inheritance. Some can make no claim at all from Parents, they are the first of their house, of honour or inheritance. This was the case of *Abraham*, he had no interest from *Terah*; such was the case of the Primitive Converts, and such is the case of the *Indians*, that now by a gracious providence are converted by the *English*. Some can go no farther

then their immediate Parents; they were the firſt in honour, or that gained an inheritance to their houſe. This was the caſe of *Iſaac*, and of thoſe children called by the Apoſtle, holy, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and will be the caſe of the children of the *Indian* Converts, Others can riſe to the third or fourth generation; others can go as high as the Conqueſt; ſome can claime beyond the Conqueſt, by deeds beyond date: ſo it is with ſome Chriſtians, all may go as high as Anceſtours have been in Chriſtianity.

8. Eightly, *If by vertue of that promiſe Predeceſſours may without the immediate parent give right to Baptiſme, then the children of an immediate parent apoſtatized from the Faith, and excommunicated from the Church, may be baptized.*

The intereſt of infants of excommunicate perſons in Baptiſme.

I have ſpoke already to the children of Apoſtates, and as to the children of excommunicate perſons, I readily yield his concluſion, that I may baptize them, againſt which, he thus farther reaſons.

If I may baptize the children of an excommunicate parent, then I may baptize the children of one who is no Member of a Church, (for ſo is the excommunicate perſon); ſo conſequently the children of a Turk or Indian, for they are no members of a Church, and the excommunicated perſon is no other, in reſpect of his communion in Church-priviledges.

I anſwer, if excommunication be onely out of a particular viſible congregation (as ſome ſay,) then the reply is eaſie, being thus excommunicate his right, in the Church univerſal viſible, ſtill remaines, and into this, it is that we admit Members by Baptiſme, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. otherwiſe a Chriſtian were a Chriſtian reſpective onely to one congregation, and that congregation falling, his Chriſtianity muſt fall with it; and being taken into a new one, he muſt be alſo admitted anew by Baptiſme.

But I farther anſwer. A Church-Member may be conſidered, either *quoad jus ad rem*, or *quoad jus in re*; either reſpective to a fundamental proper right, or a preſent perſonal actual fruition of his intereſt. An excommunicate man in the former ſenſe is a Church-Member, not in the later; This excommunication is a ſequeſtration, not a confiſcation. He himſelfe is ſuſpended from

preſent

present benefit, not cut off from all title, as several wayes may be made to appear.

1. The Text saith, *Let him be as an Heathen or a Publican* (in respect of society with him or familiarity, saith Master *Cawdrey*, *Diatribe pag.* 218.) not an Heathen and Publicane. That Text, 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. is ordinarily understood of Excommunication; yet there the caution is added, *Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother*, vers. 15. A brother is a Church member, an excommunicate person is a brother. That which is for cure, not only of the body, but of the member in particular, is not a total dismembring: But this sentence is for cure of the particular member, *For the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 5. 5. a *Excommunication is not like poyson that is given to an enemy for death, but a medicine that is given to a brother for life*, saith *Gomarus* in 2 *Thes.* 3. 15. Certainly Gods casting out of his Kingdome, *Matth.* 8. 12. taking away his Kingdome, *Mat.* 21. 3. removal of his Candlestick, *Rev.* 2. 5. the breaking off from the Olive, *Rom.* 11. 17. is a sentence farre above Excommunication. To let passe Authours of this minde, *Zanchy*, and *Perkins*, quoted by Master *Firmin*. The National Synod of *France*, 1583. The Divines of *Geneva*, *Calvine*, Dr. *Ames. Danæus*, *Brochman*, quoted by Master *Cawdrey*, *Diatribe*, *page* 216. and examine it by reason. Either the excommunicate persons sin divests the childe, or else the Churches censure; But neither the sin, nor the censure: *Ergo*. 1. Not the sin as may appear, 1. By an Argument, *ad hominem*. Our *Dissenting Brethren* (as we heard) allow the Baptisme, notwithstanding sin before the sentence of Excommunication; It is not then the sin in their judgement that doth divest them. 2. By an Argument *ad rem*. No sin but that of nature descends to posterity; man transmits not his personal vices, neither fault nor guilt, no more than his graces. And for the sentence that cannot reach the childe, I never read that Church-censures were like that plague laid upon *Gehazi*, to cleave to him and to his seed. In any legal proceeding, the childe is not to be punished for the fathers fault; there was a Law against it, *Deut.* 24. 16. *The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin*; and *Amaziah* King of *Judah* is commended for observation of it,

a *Hæc enim excommunicatio non est instar veneni, quod hosti datur ad exitium, sed medicina, quæ fratri datur ad salutem.*

and (in his acts of juſtice) proceeding according to it, 2 *Chron.* 25. 34. and we read not that any Eccleſiaſtical cenſure ſhould tranſtend it. The child of a thief is not committed with him to priſon, & I ſee no reaſon that he ſhould be committed with him to Satan: I ſay then there is right to Baptiſm in the child of an excommunicate perſon. I wiſh our Brethren would ſtick here, & not refuſe thoſe children, whoſe parents are under no Excommunication.

As to the third, our Authour; 1. Premiſes a queſtion, *Whether is this bare profeſſion of Faith in Chriſt, (though Parents be groſſely ignorant, ſcandalous, and refuſe to ſubject to Church-diſcipline) ſufficient to make a man, and continue him a Member of the Church viſible.* And then proceeds to arguments, as to his queſtion; I wonder how he can imagine that it makes any thing to his queſtion; and in caſe it were wholly yielded him, whether thence he could draw his concluſion, that Miniſters in *England* ſhould not baptize the infants of all that profeſſe the Faith in Chriſt Jeſus. He confeſſeth in this queſtion he hath diſadvantage. *For if a man be looked upon* (ſaith he) *as a viſible Saint, and reputed a Member of a true Church; if that Member be very ſcandalous, and the Church let him alone and not deale with him, that perſon may challenge any Ordinance in the Church, both Baptiſme and Lords Supper. But I conceive ſuch a perſon is not ſufficiently qualified to make a Member of a Church, nor ought to be continued a Member of the Church; but the Church ought to ſeek to reforme him, or if not to caſt him out: ſo that if the Church will let ſuch a perſon alone, and give him theſe Ordinances, there will be guilt charged upon that Church.*

Here, is his acknowledgement that they are continued Church-Members, though they ſhould not be continued, and ſee what he hath further; *It is true, the wicked Jewes being members of that National Church, ſo long as their Membership held, they might challenge circumciſion, ſo for wicked perſons ſo long as they continue members, and the Church lets them alone, they may challenge Baptiſm,* and ſo upon his own grounds, they may of right challenge it, and Miniſters then muſt needes do wrong in caſe they deny it, and ſo in all mens judgements, the queſtion is concluded in the Affirmative; yea, ſhould the Church paſſe to the higheſt of her cenſures, through all that is allowed to the higheſt top, yet ſtill the perſon under cenſure continues in a fundamental right

right of Membership, though debarred of preſent fruition, and ſo their infants entituled, as we have ſeen, to Baptiſme. His Arguments are worthy of examination, in which he concludes ſuch a one is not fit to be a Member.

Arguments to carry the queſtion in the negative anſwer.

Firſt, *Members of Churches according to the Goſpel are Saints viſible: But ſuch a perſon as the queſtion mentions, is not a viſible Saint: Ergo.* The Minor he proves, *Such as will ſay that ſuch a perſon as the Queſtion mentions is a viſible Saint, I thinke his eyes are not good. He that tells me, the Saints which* Paul *mentions in thoſe places were no other than ſuch a perſon as is in the Queſtion, he muſt pardon me, though I beleeve him not.*

Anſw. Viſible Saint, is taken, either in regard of Separation for, and dedication to God, or for real qualifications according to the power of godlineſſe, in the firſt ſenſe, ſuch are real Saints, that he mentions and rejects, in which ſenſe we have ſhewn [Saint] to be frequently taken, and ſuch were moſt of the Members of the Church of *Sardis*, there being few that had not defiled their garments, and many ſuch in the Church of *Corinth*: In the ſecond ſenſe (and I know not a third) his eyes are better than mine, that can determine concerning them. Inward graces onely make a real Saint, and theſe to me are inviſible: if he meanes ſo far as mens judgements can upon any fair ground conclude that they are ſuch, then the Apoſtles will be involved in our guilt, who hand over head admitted members the ſame day they were converted, being in foul ſins, and never ſtaying time to make judgement of the hopeful truth of their graces. *Paul* calls all thoſe that he perſecuted, Saints, *Acts* 26. 10. So doth *Ananias*, *Acts* 9. 13. all thoſe for whom after converſion he ordered and made Collections 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. And theſe were ſome of them as bad as any that in his Epiſtles he reproves.

Secondly, *If a bare profeſſion in Chriſt be ſufficient to make a member of a Church, then no perſon can juſtly be excommunicated out of a Church for the vileſt ſins or hereſies, provided he doth but hold this profeſſion of his faith, the conſequence is cleare, the perſon is the ſame which he was when you took him into the Church.* The conſequence is clearely erroneous: for he made a profeſſion of his faith, and not of ſin, as we ſee in *Simon Magus.*

Thirdly, *He that manifeſtly oppoſeth Chriſt in his viſible Kingdome,*

dome, is not fit to be a member of a Church. But ſuch a perſon as the queſtion mentions doth manifeſtly oppoſe Chriſt in his viſible kingdome. Ergo, Not fit to paſſe without cenſure, ſhould have been added: but whiles he acts rebellion, he profeſſeth ſubjection and in the Apoſtles language is a profeſſor, *Tit.* 1. 2. Having thus made way he propounds ſeveral Arguments, that Miniſters by the Goſpel are not to baptize the children of ſuch Parents.

We come now to our Authours arguments; Firſt, *Such perſons as* de jure *ought, and* de facto *are excluded by godly Miniſters from the Lords Supper, ought alſo to be excluded from their childrens Baptiſme; But ſuch perſons as the Queſtion mentions* de jure *ought, and* de facto *are excluded from the Lords Supper*: Ergo. The Major is proved, *If Baptiſme doth ſeale to the ſame covenant which the Lords Supper doth, and doth ſignifie and ſeale as great bleſſings and priviledges as the Lords Supper doth, then thoſe who are excluded from the Lords Supper, ought alſo to be excluded from their childrens Baptiſme: But the Antecedent is true:* Ergo. *The Conſequent.* This is Maſter *Blackwoods* argument to keep infants from Baptiſme, becauſe they are kept from the Supper: And if it be of any validity to ſerve our Authors turn, it is of as great force for Maſter *Blackwood*; Give me leave in Maſter *Blackwoods* behalfe to urge it in this manner, with the leaſt change of words that is poſſible: If Baptiſme doth ſeal to the ſame covenant which the Lords Supper doth, and doth ſignifie and ſeale as great bleſſings and priviledges as the Lords Supper doth: then thoſe that are excluded from the Lords Supper ought alſo to be excluded from Baptiſme; But all infants are excluded from the Lords Supper *eo nomine*, becauſe they are infants; and therefore they are to be excluded from Baptiſme. When Maſter *Firmin* hath given a faire and full anſwer to this Syllogiſme, he may eaſily fit it to his own, to give like ſatisfaction. An infant in covenant may be admitted by that ſigne and ſeale, in the uſe of which he is meerely paſſive, and yet be kept back on the account of his infancy, from that ſign and ſeale, which the Participants muſt actually improve for their ſpiritual benefit, and conſequently a Parent may put a preſent bar to his actual admiſſion (by reaſon of preſent guilt) to the one, when his innocent infant can put no barre to his admiſſion to the other. The Parent ſtands *de jure*

entituled,

entituled, when for the present he may be for his spiritual benefit *de facto* suspended. Another reverend Authour hath made use of this argument from the uniformity of the service of God in general, and in particular from the uniformity in the Sacraments to another purpose; not to exclude any infants at all who descend from Christian Parents, from Baptisme, but for admission of all visible Church-Members, not under the sentence of Excommunication, to the Lords Supper. As, one from the suspension of Parents from the Lords Supper would conclude the suspension of infants from Baptism; So, the other from the admission of all infants without difference to Baptism, would infer, not onely a just warranty, but also a necessity of answerable admittance of their Parents to the Lords Supper: 'Let our Independents (*saith he*) answer, Why do you allow a *Syntax* in 'the service of God besides, and bring in a *Qua genus* of *Anomales* and *Heteroclites* onely at this Ordinance? let some of our 'Presbyterians answer how can we admit of children as members of the visible Church being borne of Christian parents unto 'Baptisme, and yet turne away the parents of those children 'from the Sacrament? Those that have gone about to answer 'this, had better haply have said nothing: for our free course 'of Baptisme, and a denial of this is such a seam-rent, as will 'never be handsomely drawn up, though stitcht together; ne-'vertheless in yielding the one, they have granted the other; As to this passage, I first marvel how this is laid to the charge of Independents, that they allow a *Syntax* in the whole service of God besides, and bring in *Anomalaes* and *Heteroclites*, onely at this Ordinance; namely, the Lords Supper; when it is plain that they have as many *Heteroclites* in Baptisme as the Lords Supper. And in both the Sacraments (as to those that they judge admittible) they keep the form as whole as himself contends it ought to be kept, how many rents soever they may make besides. The same latitude that they hold in admission of parents to the Supper, they hold in admission of children to Baptisme. And for Presbyterians, their admission of infants to the one, will by no meanes conclude them under any necessity of admission of the parents to the other Sacrament; Nor on the contrary will their suspension of parents, conclude any necessity of like suspension of infants; Every tub must stand on its own bottome, every one

muſt beare his own burden; when parents divolve a covenant-title, they do not divolve a covenant-breach upon their children. And I deſire to know how he will keep up any ſuch uniformity that he contends for, according to that which I conceive to be his own opinion. Perſons under Excommunication are confeſſed to be uncapable of the Lords Supper; I deſire to learne whether that ſentence, cut off from the Church root and branch? Whether it be a ſentence perſonal or hereditary? I much miſtake my Authour, in caſe he will maintaine the latter, that that ſword is held out with ſo keen an edge, to lop off both parent and child; If he admit the former, than the ſame rent is made, of which he ſo much complaines. Presbyterians, that keep thoſe perſons from the Sacrament as a degree of puniſhment in order to that ſentence of Excommunication (as they uſe to ſpeake) whom they judge to be in a way deſerving it, and admit their infants to Baptiſme, make no other manner of rent in the worſhip of God, than thoſe that keep back perſons under actual excommunication, and give the like admiſſion to infants. The ſtate of Parent and childe reſpective to the covenant is homogeneal. If the root be holy, the branch is holy, and ſo *è contra*, yet the parent by his miſdemeanour may incur that cenſure of which his infant is not deſerving. His argument ſhould run thus, If the guilty parent be debarred of a priviledge, then the innocent childe ought to be debarred likewiſe: me thinks a difference might be put between a ſcandalous parent that is active, and an innocent childe that is paſſive; a parent that cannot, will not improve it to his comfort, but to his judgement, and a child that cannot miſ-improve it; *My Argument* (ſaith he) *runs upon the firſt ſuppoſition, that the childe brings nothing with it; conſidered as abſtracted from the parent, but it is the parent gives the right.* And the parent conferres right in covenant, Though he breakes covenant, yet conferres not the tranſgreſſion of it; the Argument were as good that the childe muſt neceſſarily be admitted to the Lords Table, becauſe the father did worthily receive it. If it be ſaid, the father is worthy, ſo is not the childe; ſo we ſay, the father is unworthy of the one, *i. e.* renders himſelf unworthy, and ſo doth not the child of the other.

The

The second Argument. 'Such parents as if they themselves 'were now to be baptized, ought not to be baptized, cannot 'justly challenge Baptisme for their children, neither are we 'bound to administer it. But such parents as the Question men- 'tions, if they now were to be baptized, ought not to be bap- 'tized. *Ergo.* This argument is of the same stamp with the former, and needs no other answer, The parent hath contracted a great load of guilt, of which the infant is innocent; This argument well-followed home might unbaptize a great part of those that are of this judgement, and render all their priviledges in Church-Ordinances fruitlesse, for want of a previous Baptisme.

The third argument. 'If Ministers in baptizing are bound to hold 'to their Commission, then the children of such parents as the que- 'stion mentions, are not to be baptized. But the Antecedent is true, 'none will deny that; *Ergo.* The consequence is true. Ministers by 'their Commission, *Matth.* 28. 19 (μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες) 'are bound to baptize Disciples, but these are no Disciples, *Ergo.* 'My argument tends to this, If the parent be not a Disciple, the 'childe is none: But such a parent is none, *Ergo.* his childe is 'none. Here he sayes, *the Anabaptists triumph*, and well they may, if there be any strength in this argument. *But* (saith he) *we can easily distinguish*; and I say we can distinguish as easily. Distinctions sufficient may be seen, *chap.* 38. where it is sufficiently made good that these in question are Disciples, Disciples as to the participation of Ordinances; Even a truantly untoward boy is of the number of Scholars, and, as he well deserves the lash, so he hath the priviledges of the School.

The fourth argument. 'To administer the Seale of the co- 'venant of grace to a child by vertue of him who is visibly in 'covenant with Satan, must needes be a prophaning of the 'Ordinance. But to administer Baptisme to a childe by ver- 'tue of such a one as the question mentions, is to admini- 'ster the Seal of the covenant of grace to a child by vertue of 'one who is visibly in covenant with Satan. *Ergo. The 'minor is thus by him proved.* A person grossely ignorant in 'the fundamentals of Religion, his course of life, his trade 'is to live in sinne, scandalous, &c. What shall we say of such 'a one, though he doth not formally make a covenant with the 'Devil, &c.

To be viſibly in covenant, and formally enter no covenant, is little leſſe then a contradiction: put the argument into form. To adminiſter the Seale of the covenant of Grace to a childe, by vertue of him that is formally in covenant with God, and really does ſervice to Satan, muſt needs be a prophaning of the Ordinance; and then the weakneſſe of his argument will appeare viſible, and no viſibility of a covenant with Satan found. I do not know a man or woman in the world, whoſe childe I could refuſe on this account. Thoſe to whom our Saviour ſpeaks in the ſharpeſt language, *Joh.* 8. 44. *You are of your father the Devil, and the luſts of your father ye will do*, were men in covenant with God, and had their children initiated with the ſigne and ſeal of the covenant, he farther ſaith, *I wonder how Miniſters pray, when they baptize the childe of ſuch a one, they cannot but have ſome eye to Gods covenant, and do we not mention ſo much to the Lord, that he having taken the parent into covenant with himſelfe, he doth alſo the ſeed of the parent, and ſo we plead the covenant, and a bleſſing, &c. but when a godly Miniſter ſhall carry the parent in his heart thus, doth not his heart check him, trouble him, in the thought of the parent?* They may well pray that God will make his Ordinances (through his Spirit) of power, that the infant of a covenant-breaking father, may be a covenant-keeping childe, that ſuch an *Abaz* in covenant, and breaking covenant, may have an *Hezekiah* keeping covenant; ſuch an *Ammon*, a *Joſiah*, and this without the leaſt check of conſcience. This is frequently heard of God, and prayers for the children of godly parents frequently denied: *David* hath an *Ammon* and *Abſalom*, *Jehoſhaphat* a *Jehoram* and *Joſiah* a *Jehoaz*; Their conſcience would infinitely more check them, (if the word regulate their conſciences) when providence conferres priviledges of Ordinances on ſuch an infant to be received where ſalvation is, upon ſo weak, and as to Scripture unheard of plea, as his fathers tranſgreſſion to keep it out.

For a fifth Argument. He hints two things which he would have ſeriouſly taken into examination, though he ſayes he will not put them into form. 1. 'How exceedingly this Ordi-'nance is ſleighted, abuſed through this heedleſſe adminiſtring 'of the Ordinance; for we ſee perſons never minde the Ordi-

nance

'nance beforehand, nor after: But come let us have our chil-
'dren baptized, and that is all; if they can make a feast, and
'drink after it, that is well. This is the argument of *Anabaptists* against infant-Baptisme; Because some Reverend Divines complaine that few improve their Baptisme received in infancy, to any spiritual advantage to their souls, therefore it is in vaine to Baptize infants. One is like the other, in Ordinances of God, to reason from the abuse, to the casting of them aside. Non-singers of Psalmes (which himselfe professes to oppose) may reason in this sort, and upon like ground some have warned men out of Christ not to pray, they ought to forbeare till they are in Christ. And when a natural man blesses God for a good crop, that it were as good that he cursed him. If men were disposed to wrangle, here doubtlesse were more colour against such mens performances of duties, in which onely themselves are interessed, than against parents tender of their infants to an Ordinance, in which of right they are entitled, though they lay not to heart a right and pious way of performance of it. 'Besides, (*saith he*)
'it is strange to see how we jumble the most holy and prophane
'men together; If Master *Greenham*, Master *Perkins*, Master
'*Rogers*, Master *Dod*, or whom you will, should come and
'bring their children to be baptized, let the most ignorant sot,
'drunkard, swearer, uncleane person, scorner of godlinesse,
'&c. come, he shall have his childe baptized as well as they.
'Have they their children taken into covenant? so have I sayes
'the drunkard, swearer, &c. shall we owne all these men alike
'under the covenant so as to give the seale of the covenant alike
'to all? This many a time hath been in my thoughts, and in nothing did I ever receive more full satisfaction, Not one of these holy men, would have made any such complaint, and in case the children of such should meet in this Ordinance, I could as easily difference them by their visage and features, as I could respective to their severall interests or priviledges. Parents are in covenant with God, as long as they keep up the name and profession of Christians; the one with all care walks up to the termes of the covenant, and the other are as loose and careless in it: Master *Greenham*, Master *Perkins* could not transmit to their children their graces; Neither do these transmit their personal wickednesse: Look into the Common-wealth of *Rome*, and call

out the moſt deſerving Patriots, ſet againſt them *Verres*, *Catiline*, or who you will, freedome of birth, intereſt in native priviledges is like to the iſſue of either, and ſo it is in the Church of God, the Common-weale of *Iſrael*: and it can be no otherwiſe; if there be any priviledge divolved from parent to childe; And when this falls, infant-Baptiſme falls together with it; nothing in the childe (as our Authour well obſerves) without relation to the parent can give any intereſt.

CHAP. LX.

The application of the whole in ſeveral inferences.

TO winde up the whole of this diſcourſe of the birth-priviledge of the ſeed of Beleevers in ſome practical application.

1. All poſſible engagements and obligations to holineſſe.

First, All poſſible engagements and obligations unto all holineſſe of converſation neceſſarily follows and flowes from this royal priviledge, and high advancement of birth-holineſſe; If we contend for their dignity, and minde them not at all of duty, of the honour of their birth, and call them not to a ſuitable life; In the neglect of duty they may ſoon make forfeiture of their dignity, and turn this ſingular mercy into the higheſt aggravation of their miſery: we blame thoſe of noble and generous birth, that betake themſelves to ſordid and ignoble wayes, Thus degenerating they are a blot to their families, a diſgrace and reproach to the race; no birth equal in honour to that of Chriſtians. *Theodoſius* worthily eſteemed it a greater honour that he was a Chriſtian, than that he was an Emperour: None degenerate ſo foully and blame-worthily, as they when their converſation is unchriſtian, wayes of ſin are for ſinners of the Gentiles, a way proper for Turks and Pagans, let the holy ſeed be holy, their demeanour ſuited to their honour. *Sardanapalus* the King may with leſſe infamy ſpin among women, or *Domitian* the Emperour ſpend his time in catching of flies, works farre below their dignities, than a Chriſtian may ſin with a Heathen. The Martyrs in Primitive times being moved to ſwear by the fortune of *Cæſar*, thought that the anſwer

was

w as full, and fair, to say they were Christians: Such answer should he have that would tempt to ungodlinesse, *should such a one as I fly?* saith *Nehemiah*, Nehem. 6.11. his honour would not suffer him to be so base; should such a man as a Christian (the least of whom is greater than *Nehemiah* better, *Mat.* 11.11.) be for sin? He that is not a sinner by birth, should be no sinner in his life. Baptisme is the greatest honour, such bear Christs name, and weare his livery; they have that title in which *Jude* and *James* with other of the Apostles gloried, *A servant of Jesus Christ*. Baptisme is the greatest engagement, *Let every one that nameth Christ depart from iniquity*, 2 Tim. 2.19. To talk of Baptisme, and to live in sin, is to wear the colours of one, and plot and fight for another; to wear Christs colours, and fight for Satan. Baptisme renders a sinner up to the heaviest punishment. The high favours shewed to the Jewes, made a Jew to fare worse in the wayes of sin than an Heathen, *Amos* 3.2. The high favours shewed to Christians make Christians to fare worse in sinful wayes than Heathens, *Heb.* 2.3. All in a Christians calling bespeaks this holinesse. God by whom he is called, 1 *Pet.* 1.15. The work to which he is called, 1 *Thes.* 4.7. The company unto which he is joyned, *Ephes.* 2.19. The attendants by whom he is guarded, *Matth.* 25.31. The rule whereby he is guided, *Rom.* 1.2. The Seale by which he is confirmed, *Ephes.* 1.13. And the place whither he makes and tends, *Heb.* 9.8. all are holy.

Parents must see that their childrens breeding do answer their birth.

Secondly, Let the parents of such seed, now see what education is expected. Breeding must answer birth and descent; A Christian is of the noblest birth, he must therefore have the most noble education; and the Apostle calls upon parents to bring up their Children *in nurture and admonition of the Lord*, *Ephes.* 6.4. God may call on them thus to bring up his children, in nature theirs, in covenant Gods. Every Christian parent, hath a childe of God committed to his care and tuition: How great a solœcisme is it, that Parents should dedicate children, so soon as borne unto Christ, professing to the world that they belong to him; and that with *Hannah* concerning *Samuel*, they intend them for him, when nothing appeares in their education, but that they might have been given to *Molok*, somewhat worse than the mongrell seed that spoke halfe in the language of *Canaan*, and halfe in the language of *Ashdod*, *Nehem.* 13.24. Scarce

a word can be heard out of their mouths, to argue that they are Chriſtians, liſping out oaths as ſoone as words; put to learne trades, and little regard had that they might know Chriſt Jeſus. And how much is it to be deſired, that authority would take order, for more careful catechiſtical teaching of youth in the wayes of Chriſtian Religion, that God may not complaine of *England*, as of *Iſrael*, *My people periſh for want of knowledge*, Hoſ. 4.7. A people of God, and a people ignorant to perdition and deſtruction; *England* is highly honoured of God by this gracious call, with *Capernaum lifted up to heaven*; *England* would highly honour God, if care might be taken, that all might know God from the higheſt to the loweſt; we ſhall never be a Goſpel-like people, till we be a knowing people, till we take care, that as we are Jewes by nature, ſo we may be Jewes in qualification, ſo borne, ſo bred, that as our youth is deſcended, ſo alſo they may be trained; That as God honours our children with his name, calling them his children, ſo they may honour his name, and advance his glory in all holineſſe of converſation.

The danger of perſecution.

Thirdly, Thoſe may yet ſee whom they oppoſe, that ſtand in oppoſition of a people thus intereſſed, a people ſo ingratiated to God in covenant, that there is not the leaſt infant in whom God hath not his title, and right of challenge. The aggravation of the *Pſalmiſts* complaint is, that *the Heathens are come into thine inheritance, the dead bodies of thy ſervants have they given to be meat unto the foules of the heaven, the fleſh of thy Saints unto the beaſts of the Earth*, *Pſalme* 79. 1, 2, 3. The whole body of ſuch a people, root and branch, ſtand in relation to God as the inheritance, the ſervants, the Saints of God; ſuch inſcriptions we finde in Saint *Pauls* Epiſtles, not one of the whole body is excluded, but they are ſuch by covenant, and ſuch by calling. Enough hath been ſaid to make it to appeare that the denomination reaches even infants who are the Lords heritage, *Pſalme* 127. 3. and Chriſts name is upon them, *Matth.* 18. 5. As it is accounted an happy work to daſh the little ones of *Babylon* againſt the wall, *Pſalme* 137. 9. becauſe of the hoſtility of that Nation againſt God and his people: ſo it

is

is a like execration to intermeddle with the little ones of *Sion*, by reaſon of the holineſſe of ſuch a people, their covenant-relations in which they ſtand intereſſed, 2 *Kings* 8. 12. Much is ſpoken in Scripture againſt the enemies of the righteous, the haters of them ſhall be deſolate, he that offends againſt them ſhall not be innocent, *Pſalme* 34. 21. God obſerves every carriage of the adverſary towards them in miſery, they ſpeak not a word but God hath it againſt them; when Ammonites, Tyrians, cry Aha, againſt the people of God, they are witted with it, and threatned for it, *Ezek.* 26. 2. 36. 2. Not a proud word that they utter but it is brought in, to fill up the charge againſt them, *Obad.* 12. *Pſalme* 137. 7. yea, every eye that is caſt with approbation of the adverſary, *Obad.* 13 14. Every encouraging word they ſpeak, and every act they do againſt ſuch a people, yea injuries of elder times are kept in the deck, and laid to them, *Deut.* 25. 17. And all becauſe they ſtand in this relation to God as his in covenant, which you cannot limit onely to the perſonally righteous, but all that are of a Society and fellowſhip, that is, ſuch as are intereſſed in a righteous cauſe. The holy anointing oile did make ſacred when yet too often the man was wicked, and therefore *David* looked upon *Saul* as the Lords Anointed. It holds in Analogy and proportion unto all that have any unction from God, as all the called of God have. When they were but a few in number, yea very few, and ſtrangers; when they *went from one Nation to another, from one Kingdome to another people, he ſuffered no man to do them wrong, yea he reproved Kings for their ſakes, ſaying, Touch not mine Anointed*, *Pſalme* 105. 12, 13, 14, 15. All the people of God have that Anointing from God, that none may dare to intermeddle for their harme. God promiſes his people that dwell in *Sion*, that the burthen of *Aſſyria* ſhall be taken from off their ſhoulder, and his yoke from off their neck, and that the yoke ſhall be deſtroyed, becauſe of the Anointing, *Iſaiah* 10. 27. Some will ſay, as this is carried, The danger of intermeddling with any is with us a like: Even Papiſts and the worſt of men that are called Proteſtants; are thus of a people that are called Gods people,

and go by the name of Chriſtians. For anſwer I ſhall not enter upon that controverſie, what there is of the being of a Church under the Papacy. The Papacy it ſelf is none of it, but onely a botch bred in it, and cleaving to it; onely this I ſay, That he that ſhall oppoſe a Papiſt, under the notion of a Chriſtian, ſhall bear his ſinne, and that upon the grounds that have been given. Though a Papiſts damnable errors in the faith ſhut him out from the happineſſe of Chriſtians, yet ſuch an adverſaries perſecution renders him guilty of oppoſing the faith of Chriſt Jeſus. And he that follows with injuries a carnal Proteſtant, becauſe of profeſſion of the ſincerity of Religion, in oppoſition to Antichriſtianiſme, is formally guilty of perſecution. The hearers reſembled to the rocky ground ſuffer perſecution for the Word, as doth the good ground that brings forth fruit with patience, *Mat.* 13. 21. But to come home with more cleare ſatisfaction. A people of foully polluted Ordinance, ſtanding in oppoſition to a people of a pure and untainted way, are as a people void of Ordinances, are as a people without God in compariſon. The oppoſition of the purity of his ſervice, God accounts as the oppoſition of his great name; though it be by a people that go under that name of his people. And therefore though *Elijah* take ſo much to heart the pulling down of Altars ſet up by *Jeroboam*, looking upon them as Gods Altars, when it was done by *Iſrael* apoſtatizing and turned to *Baal*, 1 *Kings* 19. 10. and in oppoſition to the worſhip of *Baal*, makes that way of worſhip at *Dan* and *Bethel* a following of God; yet we know how the Prophet from the mouth of God did cry out againſt that Altar, which *Jeroboam* erected, and foretold the deſtruction of it, and the ſlaughter of the Prieſts that offered upon it, 1 *Kings* 13. 2. and with what honour that act of *Joſiah* is mentioned in accompliſhment of this prophecy, 2 *Kings* 23. 15. and the brand that lies upon *Jeroboam* himſelf in bringing in that worſhip of his, 2 *Kings* 15. 9. ſcarce the like on any man in Scripture, the man of ſinne onely excepted, the high phraſes alſo in which this worſhip is ſet out, making Prieſts for the high places, and devils, 2 *Chron.* 11. 14, 15. with the heighth of guilt to which he roſe, in caſting the

Levites

Levites out from executing the Prieſts office, *Hoſea* 4. 6. And howſoever God often calls that people of the ten tribes by the name of his people as having Ordinances, though miſerably polluted, yet in oppoſition to *Judah* where more pure Ordinances were enjoyed, they are ſaid to be without God, without a teaching Prieſt, and without the law, 2 *Chron.* 15. 3. And fighting againſt *Judah* (who could reckon up the particulars of the Ordinances of God in their purity) they are charged to fight againſt the Lord God of their fathers, 2 *Chron.* 13. 12. To come nearer home in an inſtance. If the Turkiſh power ſhould fall upon a Popiſh State, under the name and notion of Chriſtians, they were guilty with *Saul* of perſecuting the Lord Jeſus. If this Popiſh State fall upon a reformed Nation, they are much more guilty; A fouler ſinne for a people of God in name and title, to perſecute his people in truth, than for a people, ſtrangers to God, to perſecute a people onely in name and title. Scripture-prayers againſt Heathens we may fitly apply in our ſufferings under the hands of Papiſts. *Pilate* might have been guilty of perſecution of a Phariſee, under the notion of a Jew, and yet that Nation was much more guilty in delivering up Chriſt into the hands of *Pilate*, though Chriſt had been no greater than the meaneſt of his Diſciples. A Papiſt perſecuting a formal carnal Proteſtant, under notion of a man proteſting againſt Idolatrous wayes, blaſphemes and perſecutes that faith which he holds in oppoſition againſt thoſe Antichriſtian tenents. This man being thus perſecuted, perſecuting another for the power of godlineſſe, profeſſing the ſame truth is equally, ye more guilty. The very ſinne of *Cain* againſt his brother *Abel*, 1 *John* 3. 12. their Religions were both one and the ſame, but *Cains* was onely in forme, and *Abels* in power. The reſult of the whole is to let us ſee what it is to oppoſe a people under any notion of Gods people, upon any ſuch account as belonging to Chriſt. A man may have his reward, giving to any in the name of a Diſciple, though he to whom he gives be ſuch as God will never owne for a Diſciple, and anſwerably may incurre vengeance in oppoſition of one under ſuch a name, though (with thoſe

on the rocky ground) he be nothing leſſe than ſuch in deed and truth.

Conſolation. Fourthly, Abundance of ſweet conſolations yet flow from this birth-priviledge and covenant-holineſſe, and that in ſeveral ſtreames.

1. In regard of Nations.
2. In regard of Perſons.

1. To Nations thus honoured. In regard of Nations they have royal tranſcendency above all others as alone worthy the name of a people: Nigh unto God: A people of hope: Enjoying light; when others are darkneſſe, without hope, and without God in the world. The *Pſalmiſt* reckons up many and ſweet bleſſings of a Nation. That our ſons may be as plants grown up in their youth, that our daughters may be as corner-ſtones poliſhed after the ſimilitude of a palace, that our garners may be full, affording all manner of ſtore, that our ſheep may bring forth thouſands, and ten thouſands in our ſtreets, that our Oxen may be ſtrong to labour, that there be no breaking in nor going out, that there be no complaining in our ſtreets, *Pſalme* 144. 12,13,14. All theſe are ſingular National favours, but onely ſerving to make up a comparative, not an abſolute bleſſedneſſe. This one riſeth higher and makes it compleat, Bleſſed are the people whoſe God is the Lord. The glory pertaines to a Nation thus honoured, *Rom.* 9.4. Of ſuch a people (though otherwiſe mean and deſpicable, as was *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſſe, comparative to other Nations) it may be ſaid, What Nation is there ſo great, who hath God ſo nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? *Deut.* 4.7. No people can ſo bottome their prayers againſt adverſaries, as they who are the people of Gods holineſſe; This mercy is a birth-mercy to al ſuch perſons whoſe parents with *Timothy* from one to another have been Beleevers, 2 *Tim.* 1.5. and while national provocations break not forth (which alone with God have ſeparating and deafning power) his eare is ready to hear, and his hand to help, while he ſees not iniquity in *Jacob*, nor perverſeneſſe in *Iſrael*, (which I underſtand of National out-breaches from God, which by *Balaams* counſel preſently followed to *Iſraels* danger) ſo long God is among them, as the ſhout of a King, and there is no ſorcery nor divination againſt them, *Num.* 23. 21,23. A Nation faſt to God hath God

faſt

fast to them, *The Lord is with you, while ye are with him*, 2 Chron. 15. 2.

In regard of persons, for { Themselves. / Posterity.

2. To single persons.

For themselves, it is much to be able with the *Psalmist* to say, Thou art he that took me out of the wombe: Thou didst make me to hope when I was upon my mothers breasts. I was cast upon thee from the wombe, thou art my God from my mothers belly, *Psal.* 22. 9, 10. This puts upon confidence in prayer (as an argument drawn from long continued acquaintance) as there follows, Be not farre from me, for trouble is neer, *Ver.* 11. Such have timely knowledge of God, sucking in somewhat of him while they suck milk from the brests. An expression of height setting out this birth-happiness that hath sure more in it, then can be applied to sinners of the Gentiles; see how the *Psalmist* yet farther pleads it with God, O Lord, truely I am thy servant, I am thy servant, and the son of thy hand-maid, *Psal.* 116. 16. an allusion to the law of servants who were the inheritance of the Master in whose house they were, *Exod.* 21. 4. *Levit.* 25. 16. I am such, saith the *Psalmist* (thy servant, thy servant) with all earnestness of affection, I am of thine inheritance, I am one of those that are thy house-borne-servants, my mother was thy hand-maid, I have therefore this relation to plead; and this he pleads again and again in the same words, *Psal.* 86. 16. This great priviledge *Isaiah* in like manner takes notice of, *Isa.* 49. 1. The Lord hath called me from the wombe, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name. The Apostle mindes the Ephesians of their former condition, and will have them to remember the time past, when they were without Christ, being aliens from the Common-Wealth of *Israel*, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, without God in the world: But there never was a time in which men of this birth-priviledge were in that condition, these are Gods heritage from the wombe, and with *Timothy* (some in greater, some in lesse measure) from children have the knowledge of the Scriptures, if not with *John* Baptist full of the Holy Ghost from the wombe, *Luke* 1. 15. which yet doubtlesse is the happinesse not of few, who are eminent in sanctification, whose growth in grace is seen, and yet the begin-

1. Respective to themselves.

on the rocky ground) he be nothing leſſe tha n ſuch in deed and truth.

Conſolation. Fourthly, Abundance of ſweet conſolations yet flow from this birth-priviledge and covenant-holineſſe, and that in ſeveral ſtreames.

1. In regard of Nations.
2. In regard of Perſons.

1. To Nations thus honoured. In regard of Nations they have royal tranſcendency above all others as alone worthy the name of a people: Nigh unto God: A people of hope: Enjoying light; when others are darkneſſe, without hope, and without God in the world. The *Pſalmiſt* reckons up many and ſweet bleſſings of a Nation. That our ſons may be as plants grown up in their youth, that our daughters may be as corner-ſtones poliſhed after the ſimilitude of a palace, that our garners may be full, affording all manner of ſtore, that our ſheep may bring forth thouſands, and ten thouſands in our ſtreets, that our Oxen may be ſtrong to labour, that there be no breaking in nor going out, that there be no complaining in our ſtreets, *Pſalme* 144. 12,13,14. All theſe are ſingular National favours, but onely ſerving to make up a comparative, not an abſolute bleſſedneſſe. This one riſeth higher and makes it compleat, Bleſſed are the people whoſe God is the Lord. The glory pertaines to a Nation thus honoured, *Rom.* 9.4. Of ſuch a people (though otherwiſe mean and deſpicable, as was *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſſe, comparative to other Nations) it may be ſaid, What Nation is there ſo great, who hath God ſo nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? *Deut.* 4.7. No people can ſo bottome their prayers againſt adverſaries, as they who are the people of Gods holineſſe; This mercy is a birth-mercy to al ſuch perſons whoſe parents with *Timothy* from one to another have been Beleevers, 2 *Tim.* 1, 5. and while national provocations break not forth (which alone with God have ſeparating and deafning power) his eare is ready to hear, and his hand to help, while he ſees not iniquity in *Jacob*, nor perverſeneſſe in *Iſrael*, (which I underſtand of National out-breaches from God, which by *Balaams* counſel preſently followed to *Iſraels* danger) ſo long God is among them, as the ſhout of a King, and there is no ſorcery nor divination againſt them, *Num.* 23. 21,23. A Nation faſt to God hath God

faſt

faſt to them, *The Lord is with you, while ye are with him*, 2 Chron. 15. 2.

In regard of perſons, for { Themſelves. / Poſterity.

2. To ſingle perſons.

For themſelves, it is much to be able with the *Pſalmiſt* to ſay, Thou art he that took me out of the wombe: Thou didſt make me to hope when I was upon my mothers breaſts. I was caſt upon thee from the wombe, thou art my God from my mothers belly, *Pſal.* 22. 9, 10. This puts upon confidence in prayer (as an argument drawn from long continued acquaintance) as there follows, Be not farre from me, for trouble is neer, *Ver.* 11. Such have timely knowledge of God, ſucking in ſomewhat of him while they ſuck milk from the breſts. An expreſſion of height ſetting out this birth-happineſs that hath ſure more in it, then can be applied to ſinners of the Gentiles; ſee how the *Pſalmiſt* yet farther pleads it with God, O Lord, truely I am thy ſervant, I am thy ſervant, and the ſon of thy hand-maid, *Pſal.* 116. 16. an alluſion to the law of ſervants who were the inheritance of the Maſter in whoſe houſe they were, *Exod.* 21. 4. *Levit.* 25. 16. *I* am ſuch, ſaith the *Pſalmiſt* (thy ſervant, thy ſervant) with all earneſtneſs of affection, I am of thine inheritance, I am one of thoſe that are thy houſe-borne-ſervants, my mother was thy handmaid, I have therefore this relation to plead; and this he pleads again and again in the ſame wosds, *Pſal.* 86. 16. This great priviledge *Iſaiah* in like manner takes notice of, *Iſa.* 49. 1. The Lord hath called me from the wombe, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name. The Apoſtle mindes the Epheſians of their former condition, and will have them to remember the time paſt, when they were without Chriſt, being aliens from the Common-Wealth of *Iſrael*, and ſtrangers from the covenants of promiſe, having no hope, without God in the world: But there never was a time in which men of this birth-priviledge were in that condition, theſe are Gods heritage from the wombe, and with *Timothy* (ſome in greater, ſome in leſſe meaſure) from children have the knowledge of the Scriptures, if not with *John* Baptiſt full of the Holy Ghoſt from the wombe, *Luke* 1. 15. which yet doubtleſſe is the happineſſe not of few, who are eminent in ſanctification, whoſe growth in grace is ſeen, and yet the begin-

1. Reſpective to themſelves.

nings not known. Howſoever it is with them for perſonal qualifications, yet they are nigh when others are afarre off, *Epheſ.* 2, 13. at the pools brim waiting the Angels moving of the water, *John* 5. 3. Salvation is of the Jewes, ſaith our Saviour, *John* 4. 22. Saving Ordinances are their inheritance; They are happily ſeated under that joyful ſound which is able to ſave the ſoul, *Jam.* 1. 21. Salvation is of his houſe, who is the ſonne of *Abraham*, Luke 19. 9.

2. Reſpective to their poſterity.

As it is full of conſolation to Beleevers in reſpect of themſelves, ſo alſo in reference to their poſterity, their children are Gods children; they being the Lords inheritance, their children are his heritage in like manner, they bring forth children to God; and he ownes and challenges their ſeed as his, *Ezek*, 16. 20. An infinite love in God, an unſpeakable comfort to a perent, when the Infant who by corruption of nature, is in Satans jawes, and in no leſſe danger of hell than *Moſes* ſometimes was of the water, and not ſo much as ſenſible of his condition, God pleaſes in this ſad ſtate to look upon him, and to make it the time of love, finding out wayes for his freedome. What the Apoſtle ſpeaks from the Prophet, *Rom.* 10. 10. of Gods care of the Gentiles, is certainly true being applied to infants, I was found of them that ſought me not, and made manifeſt to them that enquired not after me. Had we that hopeleſſe opinion of our children, as Papiſts have of theirs that die without Baptiſme, what a wretched caſe were it with *David* to part with an infant out of the world? How could ſuch mourne in any other way than as thoſe that are without hope, parting with an infant without any part in Chriſt, and in no better poſture towards God than the ſeed of the ſinners of the Gentiles doomed both by the *Pſalmiſt* and the Prophet *Jeremy*, Pſalm. 79. 6. *Jerem.* 10. 25. Pour out thy wrath on the heathen that have not known thee, and upon the families that call not upon thy name; they might with *Rachel* weep for their children, and refuſe to be comforted, becauſe for eternity they are not. But we finde God more rich in mercy, entring covenant with his and their ſeed, Chriſt himſelfe imbracing them in their infancy, and taking them into his ſpecial love, as thoſe that bear his name: and though death ſhould prevent their Baptiſme, whereby they have an actual intereſt in viſible Church-priviledges, yet he that hath appointed Ordinan-

ces

ces is not tied to them, but where he hath entered covenant can ſave without them. *Bellarmine* confeſſeth that the deſire of Baptiſme in one that is in the number of the *Catechumeni* (inſtructed in the principles of Chriſt, and not baptized) doth ſave, though the text *John* 3. 5. ſo much urged by that party againſt the ſalvation of infants, underſtood with their Comment be in the letter againſt it; why then ſhould not that grace which would ſhew it ſelfe in like deſires, when the perſon is of capacity, qualifie for ſalvation in like manner? Finding this love in God, theſe bowels in Chriſt, we may ſafely conclude, that children have bliſſe, parents have comfort, parents and children have their intereſt in Church-Ordinances and Adminiſtrations.

And let God have the glory.

FINIS.

AN

ALPHABETICAL Table,

Relating to the chief Heads handled in this *Treatise*.

A

Abraham.

Circumcision was not a Seale of Faith peculiar to him. pag. 239.

Arguments evincing it. ibid.

All his seed were not in Covenant, but his seed by Promise only. pag. 298

He was not taken into Covenant as a natural Father, but as a natural Father accepting Gods tender. pag. 299

His seed is entitled to saving mercies on Gods termes. ibid.

His houshold-members out of Covenant not circumcised. page 425

See Circumcision. Root.

Actions.

Immanent and transient. pag. 132

See Justification

Adam

Was in Covenant with God. pag. 9

His integrity was connatural. pag. 103

Stood not in need of a Mediatour. p. 91

In what sense imperfect. ibid.

In case he had stood, whether he had been translated out of Paradise into Heaven? p. 100

He might have gone quick to Hell if Christ had not been promised. p. 102

See Covenant

Adoption

Adoptive-right to Baptisme questioned. P. 454

Angels.

In Covenant with God. P. 7

Needed not a Mediatour. P. 91

In what sense their obedience was imperfect. ibid.

Antiquity.

For Infant-Baptisme *cleared.* p. 416

Apostasie.

Total and partial. p. 453

Assembly.

Of Divines vindicated. p. 406

Assurance.

Is to be gathered from the conditions of the Covenant. p. 195

See Spirit.

B.

Baptisme.

Signifies not barely dipping, but every way of washing.

It is the door for admission into the Church visible. p. 275

Pharisees not denied it seeking, but being tendered rejected it. p. 272

Baptisme into particular Church-societies examined. p. 461

See Infants. Infant-Baptisme.

Beleevers.

Unregenerate persons have the name and outward priviledges of Beleevers. p. 249

Berith.

In the most proper sense signifies a Covenant. p. 37

Birth-priviledge.

Birth-interest in Ancestours-priviledges, is of the nature of the things that descend from Parent to Childe. p. 401 402

It is so in civil Priviledges, in all Kingdomes, States, Corporations. ibid.

Upon this account Protestants are taken up by Jesuites, and the Orthodox by Anabaptists in their words. p. 403

Birth-interest in Arcestours-priviledges, is held up in all other Religions. p. 405

God ownes Infants borne in the Church, upon account of their birth as his children, his servants. ibid.

Birth-interest being denied, parent and childe are heterogeneal. p. 406

Children then brought up, not in Covenant, but for Covenant. ibid.

According to Scripture-grounds, no hope left of their salvation. p. 407

Branch.

What with the Apostle it signifies, Rom. 11. 16. p. 325

Branches of two sorts. Natural and engraffed. ibid.

See Root.

C

Canaan.

Given to Abrahams *natural issue by Promise.* p. 301

That gift was an appendant to the Covenant. p. 303

The promise of it did not denominate the Covenant mixt. p. 226

Carnal.

See Covenant.

Camero's.

Assertion of an animal life in Paradise. p. 100

His distinction of an absolute and conditional Covenant, of the Antecedent and consequent love of God. p. 46, 47

Children

Acts 2. 39. *Comprizes Infants* p. 322

Not the same with sons and daughters of the Nation. vers. 17. p. 319

See Promise.

Christ.

Is the Mediatour of the Covenant of Grace, a fulnesse and fitnesse in him for that

that work. p. 92
A Covenant made of God with him. p.14
This Covenant, not the same with the Covenant of Grace made with man, ibid.
In the assumption of mans nature he did not change the law of nature. p.57
Whole Christ is to be received by Beleevers. p.190
Justification strictly so called, seemes to be the fruit of Christs passive righteousnesse. p. 123
His active and passive obedience, both concurre to mans full happinesse. ibid.
See Mediatour.

Christians.

Unregenerate persons have the name and outward priviledges of Christians. p.252

Church.

The distinction into visible and invisible, asserted and explained. p.267
See Engrassing.

Church visible.

Distinguished into universal and particular. p.269

Universal visible.

Asserted. p. 267 &c.
It consists of all that make profession of Christian Religion. p.268
Interest in it is of equal latitude with the Covenant. p. 267

Church particular.

A man by Covenant with God interessed in the universal Church visible, needs nothing farther for his accesse and interest in particular Churches. p. 270
Cohabitation makes not up a Church congregational. p. 273
Yet it is necessarily required. ibid.
A people cohabiting in a vicinity, ought to associate in Church-fellowship for Ordinances. ibid.
Professing Christians in such cohabitation are to be esteemed particular Church-members. p. 274

Church-Covenant.

Explicite or implicite. p. 459
Covenant explicite not essential to the relation of a particular Church-member. p. 460
Without any Scripture-precedent. p. 272 460
Where all is enjoyed for the being of a particular Church, much may be wanting for the well-being. p.273

Church, pure, impure.

When to be judged pure. p. 277
Impure Churches, have yet the being of Churches. ibid
Rome *a Church of most impure being.* ibid.
That which especially denominates a Church, pure, or impure, is doctrine. p.278
Doctrines tending to the defilement of Churches, are tainted either in the foundation or superstruction. ibid,
See Errors.

Parochial Churches.

Vindicated. p. 274
See Place

Circumcision.

A seale of spiritual mercies. p. 227
Both a priviledge and a bondage. p.208
Called by the name of Covenant. p. 423
It was bottomed on the commandement. p. 297
Which command had relation to the Covenant.

venant. ibid.
It was peculiar to Abrahams natural issue. p.301

Cohabitation.
See Church particular.

Commands.
Frequent and full under Moses his administration. p. 213
See Law.

Consent.
In man of necessity to his being in Covenant with God. p. 3

Consequence.
From Scripture justified. p. 416

Conditions, Covenant.
What a Covenant-condition is. p. 35
Conditions of the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace on Gods part seem to be the same. p. 99

Conditions in the Covenant of Works.
Were in mans power. p.102,103
Kept man within himself for righteousnesse. p.115,116
Their end was mans preservation. 117

Conditions in the Covenant of Grace.
Covenant of Grace hath it's conditions. p. 33,34
Arguments asserting it. p. 34, &c.
Objections answered. p. 36, &c.
These conditions are not performed without special assistance of Grace. p.104
Arguments for special assistance in this work. p.104,105
Objections answered. p. 113, &c.
These conditions carry a man out of himself for righteousnesse. p. 116
They are for mans restitution. p. 117
A people thus in Covenant, must come up to the termes and conditions of the Covenant. p. 190, &c.
No happinesse or assurance but in performance of these conditions. p. 195
Objections answered. p. 199

Covenant in general.
Figurative acceptions of the Word. p. 2
Requisites in a Covenant. p.3
Mutual contracts of the nature of it. p.38
Distinguished. p. 4
Defined. p. 5

Covenant between God and Man.
Reasons why God dealt in a Covenant-way with man. p. 6,7
Covenant between God and man defined. p.8
Definition asserted. p. 37,38
This Covenant distinguished into Covenant of Works, & Covenant of Grace. p.8

Covenant of Works and Grace.
Their agreement. p. 86
Their respective differences. p. 87, &c.

Covenant of Works.
Was entered in mans integrity. ibid.
Was alone for his preservation. p. 88
Did precede the Covenant of Grace. ibid.
Was a small time in force. p.90
Had no Mediatour. p. 91

Covenant of God with Christ.
Not the same with the Covenant of Grace entered with fallen man. p. 14,15

Covenant of Grace.
Defined. p. 159
Distinguished into the Old and New, or first and second. p. 202
Hath it's solemnities in the highest way. p. 5,12
Was entered in mans fallen estate. p.87

Is

Is for mans restitution. p. 88
Is in time after the Covenant of Works. ibid.
Is of everlasting continuance. p.90
Is in, and by a Mediatour. p. 91
God in this Covenant so manifests his free grace, that he still keeps up his Sovereignty. p. 53

Old and New, or first and second Covenant.

Their agreement in 6. particul. p.202 &c.
They are one in substance. p.204

Old Covenant.

Was administred and held forth by Servants, Prophets, Priests, &c. p. 205
It received only the Jewes. ibid.
It had its date of time, and is antiquated for another to succeed. p. 206
It was dedicated with the blood of Bulls and Goats. ibid.
It held forth Christ only in a promise to be incarnate, to suffer. p.207
It held all out under types, figures and shadowes. ibid.
Under that dispensation knowledge dim; those under it in a state of darknesse comparative *to Christians.* p. 208
Circumcision that painfull signe, was the leading initiating seale of it. p.209
Nine positions tending to clear the Old Covenant under Old Testament-dispensations. p. 210,211,212, &c.
See Moses.
It was not made up of carnal promises. p.219, &c.
The charge of the Old Covenant to be meerely carnal, serves divers intereſts.
1. *To bring down all honour and esteem of Old Testament-Scriptures.* p.220
2. *To take Infants out of Covenant.* p.221
3. *To keep Infants from Baptisme.* p.222
Testimonies evincing the spirituality of Old Covenant-Promises. ibid.
This Old Covenant was a pure Gospel-Covenant, and not mixt. p. 224

New Covenant.

It is held forth by Christ the Mediatour. p.205
It takes in all Nations. ibid. 206
It must remain till the end of time. ibid.
The dedication of it is in the blood of Christ. p.207
Christ already come in the flesh is set forth in it. ibid.
Truth without type or shadow held forth in it. p. 207,208
Light abounds, and knowledge is clear in it. p. 208
Baptisme is the initiating seal of it. p.209
It is not limtied to the Elect Regenerate. p. 231
The meaning of some Orthodox Divines, that in some expressions seem to deny it. p. 233
Severall New Testament-Scriptures evincing it. p.235, &c.
Arguments asserting it. p. 205
Absurdities following upon the restraint of the Covenant to the Elect regenerate. p.252
Objections answered. p. 257
It comprizes professed Beleevers, and their issue. p.246
The question stated as to the issue of Abraham *in severall particulars.* p. 296,297, &c
*Arguments from Old Testament-Scriptures, evincing the naturall issue of A-*braham

braham *to be in Covenant.* p.301
From New Testament-Scriptures. p.304
The grand Objection, Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8. *answered.* p.309
A second Objection that it is not in that latitude in New Testament-times answered. p. 316
1. *By Quaries put.* p.317
New Testament-authorities, Acts 2. 38,39. Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 14. Gal. 4. 29. Matth. 19. 14. p.318
3. *Arguments evincing it.* p. 401, *&c.*

D.

Death.

WHat in Scripture it implies. p.100
p. 101
The same in the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace. ibid.

διαθήκη.

The proper and most received signification denotes a Testament, and not a Covenant. p.38,39

Disciple.

Unregenerate persons have the name and outward priviledges of Disciples. p.251
Whole Nations in capacity to be Discipled. p.236
Infants are Disciples. p.413

Discipline.

God in the Covenant of Grace keeps up his Sovereignty in exercise of Discipline. p.77,78, *&c.*
See Separation.

E.

Election.

INto a Church-state. p. 340
The Covenant of Grace not commensurate with Election. p. 98
Election leads to salvation without any merit of workes. p.341
See Reprobation.

Engrafting.

There is no engrafting into the Church invisible. p. 336
Engrafting by Faith according to Election is into Christ. ibid.
Engrafting into the true Olive, Rom. 11. *is into the Church as visible. Asserted by Arguments.* p. 327, *&c.*

Errors.

Have their estimate more or lesse according as they are against Christ. p. 280
Some render Christ in an incapacity to be Mediatour. ibid.
Some are in whole or in part inconsistent with his Mediatorship. ibid.
Errours either in the foundation, or in the superstructure. p.278
In the foundation more neere, or more remote. p.279

Epample.

The Argument, that there is no example for infant-baptisme answered. p.414

Extreames.

In the worship of God dangerous. p.439

F

Faith.

IN Christ commanded in the Moral Law. p.96, *&c.*
Is a Condition of the Covenant of Grace. p.118, *&c.*
Propositions tending to clear it. p.122
Reasons to confirme it. p.119
Objections

Objections answered. p.130,&c.
As accepting Christ as a Lord it doth not justifie. p.125
It justifies as an instrument. p.126
Truth explained. p.127
Objections answered. ibid.
See instrument.
Faith of profession entitles to Baptisme. p.289
Arguments proving it. p.290
Faith and Repentance our conditions, not Gods. p.144

Faith of profession.

Entitles to the Church visible. p.334
May be lost. p.333.334

Flesh.

Birth after the flesh gives a visible title to Church interest. p.370,&c.
Children of the flesh, those who in course of nature come from Abraham, *ibid.*

G.

Gentiles.

Sinners of the Gentiles, Gal. 2. 15. *what it implies.* p.305.306
Engraffing of the Jewes and the Gentiles, Rom. 11. *is into the Church visible* p.327
See Engraffing.
Church of Jewes and Gentiles one. p.328.

Gomarus.

His answer to the Anabaptists Argument draw from Rom. 9.6,7. p.313,&c.

Gospel.

Where it is tendered and recieved, there is a Covenant. p.151
Where it is tendered and refused, there is no Covenant. ibid.

Grace.

Is the Fountaine and rise of every Covenant of God with man. p.9
The necessity of the concurrence of Grace in mans conversion. p.111
Arguments evincing it. p.104&c.
Objections answered. p.113,&c.
Sufficiency of Gospel-grace in the Old Covenant, to convince men of sin for not beleeving. p.215

H.

Holy, Holinesse.

Holinesse { *of relation.* / *of infusion.* } p.326
One and the same holinesse in every branch of the Olive, Rom. 11. ibid.
Holinesse not legitimation. p.357
Not regenerate with the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7. 14. ibid.
See places.
Holinesse of relation of persons. p.440
Of unreasonable creatures. ibid.
Persons holy in some peculiar way of service. p.44.
In a more general way as separate from Idols to God. p.447

Heaven.

See Kingdome

I.

Jew.

A Jew by nature, is one in Covenant by birth. p.306

Infant.

Those little ones that Christ recieved, and blessed, were infants. p.394
They were infants of Parents in Covenant. p.394,395

They

They were themselves in Covenant. ibid.
They were admitted upon a common right, and no special priviledge above other infants in Israel. ibid.
They were admitted to a Church-priviledge. P. 397
The Disciples excluded them upon their minority, and Christ will have that to be no bar for their admittance. P. 399

Infant-Baptisme.

By Arguments asserted. P. 410, *&c.*
Objections answered. P. 411, *&c.*
Infants of all Christian Parents have right to Baptisme. P. 448
Infants of wicked Parents. P. 448
Of misbelieving Parents. P. 449
Of ignorant Parents. ibid.
Of illegitimate birth. P. 450
Of excommunicate persons. P. 468
Right of infants of Apostates discussed. P. 453
Infants have right to Baptisme, as from immediate, so from mediate Parents. P. 465
Infants within the verge of Baptism-institution. P. 411, 412
Infants of Christian Parents entitled to the Lords Supper by jus ad rem, *not* jus in re. P. 436

Instrument.

The Word, the outward Faith, the inward instrument in justification. P. 129
Faith more aptly said to be an instrument in justification than the word. ibid.
Relative actions have not their instruments, fitly and properly so called as those that are absolute. P. 127
Faith is the instrument of man in the work of justification, and because of man in a work of this nature, it is not unfitly called an instrument of God. P. 128
See Faith. Justification.

Ishmael.

In Covenant when circumcised. P. 296
Not to be branded with bastardy. ibid.
He and his seed cast out of Covenant. P. 298

Justification.

Mans concurrence in it necessarily required in it as an acceptant, not as agent. P. 127
It is a transient act of God, not an immanent. P. 132
It is not from eternity. P. 131, *&c.*
A justified man, a man fitted for every duty to which God calls. P. 135
See Faith. Instrument.

K.

Kingdome of Heaven.

IN what sense taken, Matth. 19. 14, &c. P. 399
The Hinge of the contraversie concerning infants interest in Covenant, hangs not on the interpretation of those words. ibid.
Anabaptists reasons not sufficient to prove it to be meant of the Kingdome of Glory. P. 400
Though understood of the Kingdome of Glory, it serves not to discovenant, or dischurch infants. P. 401

L.

Law.

CONsidered as a Covenant to give life, is inconsistent with the Gospel. P. 55

Moral

Moral Law hath a commanding power over Beleevers. ibid.
By Arguments asserted. ibid.
Objections answered. p. 58
In what sense a dead husband. p. 59
See Moses.
A rule of our duty, not of our strength. p. 151

Life.

What in Scripture it implies. p. 100
The same in substance in the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace. ibid.
A Medium *may be concieved, and is by some assigned between life and death in Scripture acceptation.* p. 123

Lord.

The acceptation of Christ as Lord doth not justifie. p. 125

Love.

To do a thing out of obedience to the Law, and by love not opposite. p. 61
Love cleaves to Christ for communion, but recieves him not for justification. p. 125

M.

Master Marshal.

Vindicated. p. 435

Mediatour.

A foure-fold work respective to the Covenant incumbent on the Mediatour. p. 93, &c.
See Christ, Moses.

Metaphor.

God's entring Covenant with man, no Metaphor. p. 1037

Ministers.

Must bring their people up to the termes of the Covenant, in pressing the necessity of Faith and Repentance. p. 188, &c.
They must not sever the promise from the duty. p. 189

Ministry.

The necessity of a Ministry to bring men into Covenant, and to bring them up to the termes of the Covenant. p. 160
Reasons evincing that God hath appointed such a Ministry to be perpetuated through all ages. p. 162, &c.
Reasons evincing the necessity of such an established Ministry. p. 165, &c.
Objections answered. p. 168, 169
An orderly call from God into the Ministerial function necessary. p. 180
Reasons assigned. p. 181, 182
Several wayes of calling to the work of The Ministry. p. 182
See Ordination.
Ministry-maintenance. p. 442

Moses.

The Law as delivered by Moses, *bindes Christians.* p. 73, 74, 75
He delivered a Covenant to the Jewes. p. 210
He delivered a Covenant of Grace to the Jewes. p. 210, 211
In his time commands were frequent and full, the directive and maledictive part for discovery of sin were open and clear, but promises for eternity little known. p. 213
He was a Mediatour in type.

N.

Nature.

Taken for Birth-priviledge, or descent from Ancestors. p. 307
Taken for qualifications of nature. ibid.

Jewes by nature had priviledges above Gentiles. p. 307,308

O.

Obedience.
See Righteousneſse.

Olive.
THe whole univerſal Church viſible, Rom. 11. p. 325
Fatneſſe of the Olive, glory of Ordinances. p. 326

Ordination.
An orderly call by way of Ordination into the Miniſterial function, neceſſary in all not gifted by immediate revelation. p. 182
Ordination deſcribed. ibid.
Men in Miniſterial function, are to act in Ordination. p. 182,183
They are to ſet men apart as Presbyters and Elders. p. 184
Ordination not to be paſſed, but upon examination and tryal. p. 140
To be ſolemnized with faſting and prayer. p. 185,186
Impoſition of hands to be uſed. p. 187
Objections anſwered. ibid.

P.

Pardon.
NAtional and perſonal. p. 343

My People.
That phraſe applied in New Teſtament-Scriptures to thoſe that ſtand inviſible relation to God. p. 258

Places for worſhip.
In New Teſtament-times have their warranty.
In what ſenſe holy, p. 441
Places holy by divine inſtitution, by divine approbation. p. 439
Poſitions concerning places for worſhip in Goſpel-times. p. 441
Not in equipage with the Temple and Tabernacle. ibid.
Temple and Tabernacle had the pre-eminence in four Particulars. ibid.
Our places of meeting by good warranty called Churches. p. 441, &c.

Poſition.
This Poſition, that the Moral Law hath no commanding power over Believers examined. p. 58
That poſition concerning the Old Covenant, to be both a Covenant of Works, and a Covenant of Grace examined. p. 210

Power.
Neceſſary in the call of Nations to a viſible Church-ſtate. p. 330

Priviledge.
See Birth.

Profeſſors.
Who to be accounted ſo before men. p. 450

Promiſes.
Made to the wiked, made good to the believing and penitent. p. 190
Abſolute promiſes yield not peace to him that is wanting in the conditions of God required. ibid. & p. 47
Objections anſwered. p. 190
Spiritual promiſes rare and obſcure under Moſes his adminiſtration. p. 213
Scriptures evincing the ſpirituality of Old Teſtament-Promiſes. p. 222
Temporal promiſes annexed, as appendants to ſpiritual in the Old Covenant p. 226

Children of Promiſe.

All the seed of Abraham *by* Isaac *born, by vertue of that miraculous promise.* p. 298

Q.

Quæries.

PUt to those that restraine the New Covenant to the Elect regenerate. p. 234, &c.

Put to those that put a limit to the New Covenant, respective to the issue. p. 317

R.

Reconciliation.

GRadual or total, of persons of Nations. p. 331

Repentance.

A distinct grace from faith. p. 136

A condition of the Covenant of grace. ib.

Considered in the pra-requisites. p. 137

In the essential parts of it. ibid.

Privative part which is cessation from sin is required in Covenant. p. 140

Positive part which is a returne to God, and an holy walk with God, is required in Covenant. p. 142

See Righteousnesse.

Objections answered. p. 144, &c.

Reprobation.

No cause of unbelief or sin. p. 341

It leads not to condemnation without merit of sin, as Election leads to Salvation without merits of Works. ibid.

Righteousnesse.

What degree of righteousnesse is required in the Covenant of Grace. p. 148

Perfection of degrees is not so required, that upon the defection of it, the penalty is incurred. p. 149

Perfection of degrees is not required, and sincerity accepted. p. 151

Reasons assigned. ibid. &c.

Objections answered. p. 153

Our Evangelical righteousnesse is imperfect. p. 155, &c.

Sincerity is required and accepted. p. 112, &c.

Root and Branch.

Denote parent and childe, Rom. 11. 16. p. 325

Root.

Abraham, Isaac *and* Jacob. ibid.

Every natural parent a Root. p. 338

Every natural believing Parent an holy Root. ibid.

Abraham *a Root by communication, not by example.* p. 399

S.

Sacraments.

ARe Gospel mysteries. p. 446

Sacriledge.

Defined. p. 440

With-holding infants of believing parents from Baptism is Sacriledg. p. 437, &c.

Saints.

Unregenerate persons have the name and outward priviledge of Saints. p. 250

Salvation.

Put for saving Ordinances. p. 299, 300

Schooles.

See University.

Scholar.

The name of Scholar is applied to man of learning justified. p. 176, &c.

Scruple.

Corinthians *had their scruples about their unequal marriages.* p. 350

They had their scruple concerning their

iſſue upon ſuch marriage. ibid.
Their ſcruples aroſe not from the Apoſtles words, 1 Cor. 5. 9. p. 352
In all probability from Ezra. 9, *and* 10 Chap. p. 354
The Apoſtle brings not formal concluding Arguments, to prove the lawfulneſſe of ſuch marriage-ſociety, but removes ſcruples concerning their ſtate with their iſſue. p. 360, *&c.*

Seal.

Title to the ſeal neceſſarily followes from intereſt in the Covenant. p. 422

Separation.

In what caſes neceſſary. p. 280, *&c.*
In what caſes unwarrantable. p. 283
Members of particular Church-congregations, ought much rather to endeavour, the reformation of abuſes, than to make ſeparation p. 276
Corruption in converſation, ſcarce admits of ſeparation. p. 283
Corruption in Diſcipline ſcarce admits of ſeparation. p. 284
Old non-Conformiſts thoughts about it. p. 285
Maſter Cottens *indulgence towards it.* p. 286
To gather Churches out of Churches in a way of ſeparation unwarrantable. p. 288

Sorrow.

A pre-requiſite to repentance. p. 137
Cautions concerning it. p. 139

Sovereignty.

Held up of God in mans eſtate of grace
In keeping up his Commandments. p. 54
In exerciſe of Diſcipline. p. 77

Spirit.

Its office in the work of Aſſurance. p. 197
The immediate teſt of the Spirit queſtioned. p. 198
Cautions that ſome have put to it, overthrow it. ibid.

T.

Tradition.

Diſtinguiſhed. p. 418
Not the bottome of infant-baptiſm. p. 419

U.

Unclean.

IS not Baſtardy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. p. 357

Univerſities.

In order to a gifted Miniſtry neceſſary. p. 173, 174
Reaſons aſſigned. ibid.
Examples of them in Old Teſtament-Scriptures, and Eccleſiaſtical Writers. p. 174, 175
Objections anſwered. p. 175, 176

W.

Weakneſſe.

All weakneſſes not Covenant-breaches. p. 294

Will-worſhip.

Infant-Baptiſm, no will-worſhip. p. 437, *&c.*

Work.

Of mans ſalvation begins in an habit, not act. p. 112

Works.

In what manner called for in the Covenant of Grace. p. 146

Wrath.

Covenant-intereſt without coming up to the termes of the Covenant, delivers not from wrath. p. 315, 316

A Table of those Scriptures which are occasionally cleared, briefly illustrated, or largely vindicated in this *Treatise*.

Genesis.

Chap.	Verse	Page.
1.	28.	101.
2.	17.	9,100.
3.	17.	37.
9.	9, 10.	36.
	27.	237,204.
17.	1.	2.
	7.	43, 422.
	8.	301.
	9.	423
7.9,10.	422.301,297.	
23.	15,16.	3.
27.	34.	4.
48.	14.	186.

Exodus.

12.	48.	209.
13.	14, 15.	228.
19.	25.	213.
20.	18.	213.
21.	2.	2.
24.	6.8.	12.
	7, 8.	206.
34.	7.	122.
	30,33.	214.

Leviticus.

1.	4.	186.
8.	10.	187.
24.	14.	186.
25.	39,&c.	405.

Numbers.

6.	22, 23.	397.
20.	12.	78.

Deuteronomy.

4.	1.	216.
	13. 30,2110,&c.	
5.	1,2.	15.
	33.	216.
6.	4.	232.
	24,25.	216.
7.	7,8.	343.
9.	26,27.	303.
10.	16.	228.
12.	5.	68.
24.	16.	469.
26.	17,18. 11,15,210.	
	18,19.	7.
29.	1,2,3,&c.	230,231.
	1,4.	166.
	10,11.	15.
30.	6. 107,2116.	
	16.	21.
33.	10.	116.
34.	9.	186.

1 Samuel.

8.	15.	17.
11.	12.	3.
19.	20.	174.

2 Samuel.

1.	*ult.*	83.
12.	8,9.13,84,85.	

2 Kings.

6.	1.	174.

2 Chronicles.

34.	22.	175.

Esther.

6.	12.	

Job.

4.	18.	91.
5.	23.	2.37.

Psalme

2.	8.	237.
4.	8	7.
16.	35,&c.	26.
	45.	26.
24.	5.	48.
40	17.	152.
2.	1.	15,294.
	16,17.	141.
72.	11.	238.
74.	7, 8.	442.
78.	8,10.	255.
	34.	234.
	34,&c.	159.

Chap.	Verse	Page.
79.	12.	48.
	Psalmes.	
86.	9.	238.
94.	19.	7.
105.	12,13.	48.
106.	35,36.	453.
110.	3.	131.
119.	6.	159.
	12.	218.
	Proverbes.	
3.	11,12.	78.
5.	12.	167.
20.	2.	217.
	Canticles.	
1.	4.	105.
	Isaiah.	
2.	3.	54.
4.	1.	25.
24.	1,2,3,&c.	253,254.
5.	12.	145.
4	6,7.	2.
53.	10,&c.	14,112.
54.	5.	13.
55.	1,2.	49.
	5.	238.
		141.
58.	6,	21.
	Jeremia.	
2.	5.	193.
14.	14.	181.
22.	15.	1.
	15,16.	105.
23.	13,14.	175.
27.	15.	181.
31.	31,32,33.	20.170.
	32,33.	259.
	33.	2,107.
34.	12.	2.
	15,16.	192.
	18,&c.	253.
	Ezekiel.	
13.	22.	189.
16.	20,21.	406,26.
35.	25,&c.	107.
39.	23.	81.
	23,24.	194.
	Hosea.	
2.	18.	3.
	19.	12.
	19,20.	147.
4.	14.	80.
6.	6.	172.
	Joel.	
2.	28,29.	168,319.
	Amos.	
3.	1,2.	224.
7.	14,15.	169.
	Habakkuk.	
3.	17,18.	135.
	Zephaniah.	
3.	2.	142.
	Zechariah.	
1.	4.	446.
13.	12.	169.
	5,6.	180.
	Malachi.	
1.	11.	162.
2.	6.	179.
	Matthew.	
2.	2.	136.
4	12,17.	136.
5.	20.	147.
	48.	153,&c.
8.	11,12.	305.
10.	42.	413.
11.	13.	75.
16.	5.	206.
19.	13.	186.
	14.	393.
21.	23.	170.
	31,32.	432.
22.	21.	437.
28.	19.	235,162.
		412.
		473.
	20.	163.
22.	14.	239,267.
20.	16.	239.
	Mark.	
6.	5.	186.
	12.	136.
11.	7.	170.
10.	14.	393.
12.	34.	114.
10.	16.	186.
9.	41.	413.
	Luke.	
7.	5,9.	441,442.
	29,30.	433.
10.	16.	75.
14.	27,33.	252.
18.	16.	393.
20.	21.	170.
24.	25.	416.
	25,26.	215.
	44.	55.
	John.	
3.	16.	34.
5.	39.	215.
	46,47.	211.
6.	44.	105.
7.	37.	128.
8.	51.	34.
10.	10.	100.

Chap.	Verse	Page.
11.	40.	12.
26.	31.	12.
	Acts.	
2.	16.	168.
	38,39. 426,&c.	318.
	39.	415.
3.	19.	190.
	25.	412
5.	31.	190.
7.	51,52.	466.
8.	17.	186.
10.	43.	190.
	47.	460.
11.	12.	95.
13.	2.	186.
14.	28.	183.
15.	17.	128.
	18.	130.
16.	14.	139.
18.	7.	441.
20.	7.	415.
	21.	136,137.
	29.	167.
	Romanes.	
2.	22.	439.
	28.	37.
3.	1.	22.
	19.	123.
	20.	138.
	21.	123.
	21,22.	218.
	31.	56.
7.	1,2.	58,59.
9.	1,2,3.	394.
	6,7,8.	298,309,&c.
	9,10,11,12.	298.
	25.	258.
10.	3.	117,214.
11.	throughout.	204.
	1,2,&c.	323.
	6.	126.
	28,29.	344.
	1 Corinthians.	
2.	6.	155.
	12.	198.
	14.	166.
4.	7.	110.
5.	5,6.	287.
	11.	449.
7. 14.	349,&c.	403,464.
9.	5,6.	443.
	9.	74.
	13,14.	164.
10.	8.	229.
	17.	415.
	26.	163.
11.	28.	414.
	30.	79.
12.	12.	18.
	28.	184.
14.	21.	54.
	34.	56,57.
15.	58.	143.
	2 Corinthians.	
3.	12,13.	214.
6.	16.	258.
	17.	140.
10.	7.	78.
13.	11.	153,154.
	Galatians.	
1.	12.	182.
2.	15.	305,306.
3.	8.	18.
	14.	127.
	16.	16,17.
	18.	28.
	19.	18.
	17.	42,48.
4.	29.	366.
	30.	424.
5.	3.	149.
	6.	137,143.
	19,20.	141.
	21.	143.
6.	6.	442.
	Ephesians.	
1.	18.	166.
	19.	105.
2.	1,2.	104,105.
	6,12.	94.
	8.	113,217.
	10.	105,145.
	12.	161,208,408.
	14.	55.
3.	17.	127,128.
4.	11,12,162,167,179.	
5.	6.	142.
6.	4.	479.
	6,7.	157.
	Philipians.	
2.	6	1
	12.	144,145.
	13.	117,131.
3.	5,6.	116.
	Colossians	
1.	12.	196.
3.	5,7,8.	140.
	1.	171.
	Thessalonians.	
2.	12,13.	120,135.
5.	12,13.	164.
	11.	171.
	2 Thessalonians.	
2.	15.	419
3.	14.	469.
	1 Timothy.	
1.	22.	185.
3.	6.	185.
		10.

Chap.	Verse	Page.
	10.	185.
4.	8.	135.
	13,15.	174.
	14.	183.
	16.	217.
5.	22.	187.
6.	11.	142.
	17,&c.	200.
	2 Timothy.	
2.	15.	185.
	19.	140
	20.	240,268.
4.	8	6.
	Titus.	
1.	5.	183.
	7,8.	185.
	16.	452.
2.	14.	257.
1.	4.	249.
	Hebrewes.	
4.	2.	129,135.
6.	1.	137.
	18.	7.
8.	13.	268.
	12.	48.
9.	16,17.	39.
	19,20,21.	206.
10.	1.	207.
14.	93,214,207.	
	26.	90.
	29.	241,&c.
12.	5,6,7,	79.
13.	17.	164.
	James.	
1.	4.	153,154.
	25.	218.
	26.	109.
	27.	22.
2.	8.	57.
	21.	125.
	1 Peter.	
2.	9.	243,&c.
1.	15,16.	74.
3.	18.	123.
	21.	197.
	2 Peter.	
2.	22.	194.
	1 John.	
3.	18,19.	201
	21.	292.
	21,22.	200.
	24.	198.
	Revelation.	
3.	19.	79.
11.	15.	237
18.	4.	259.
21.	3.	258.
22.	12.	147.

FINIS.

Paul's last Farewel,

OR A

SERMON,

PREACHED

At the Funerall of that Godly and Learned Minister of

JESUS CHRIST,

Mr. THOMAS BLAKE.

By *Anthony Burgesse*, Pastor of the Church at *Sutton-Colefield* in *Warwickshire*.

With a Funeral *ORATION* made at Mr. *Blakes* death by *Samuel Shaw*, then Schoolmaster of the Free-School at *Tamworth*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Abel Roper*, at the Sun against St. *Dunstans* in *Fleet-street*. 1658

A Funerall *Oration* at the Death of the moſt deſired Mr. *Blake*.

By Mr. *Samuel Shaw*, then School-maſter of the Free-School at *Tamworth*.

With a face ſadder then uſuall, with an heart ſadder then my face, but upon an occaſion ſadder then them both, I (who was deputed to this work by him to whom I now perform it) am here, rather to receive the expreſſions of your ſorrow, then tell you the reſentments of mine own. Being ſenſible of my ſtupefaction, (cauſed, not through the want of my affections, but the want of their object) I deſire out of a pious pollicy, to ſupply my dryneſſe, by taking your Tears, and putting them into my pump, ſo hoping to revive mine own, which yet I judge are rather drowned then dryed up. And yet when I have done this, I know that all my expreſſions will fall ſhort of the greatneſs of my grief, as much as my grief does of the greatneſs of its cauſe. This numerous Company of Pious groaners, theſe ſo many blacks, not made, but occaſioned to be Mourners (badges of profeſſion becomming badges of that grief, which for its greatneſs can be equal'd by nothing but their former happineſs which they once enjoyed) the univerſall gloomineſs of this day, repreſents to me rather the funerall of a Town, then a man, and the fall of a Church, rather then a ſingle pillar: and rather induces

me to think that ye are come to quench the unmercifull heat of a feaver, then only to bedew that which was the ſubject of one. But if it may be, hold a little, and ſuffer your eyes a while to a new employment, even to ſee where you are, what you are doing, whoſe Obſequies you are ſolemnizing with ſo great devotion, and take the dimenſions of your loſſe, if it be capable of any: which indeed is ſo great, that they only can know it, who knew not him, and they onely can feel, who never enjoy'd him; I ſpeak not to aggravate your loſs, but the ſenſe of it, as for the cauſe of it, it admits of no addition. Whilſt he lived, it was as impoſsible for him not to love you, as it was for you adequately to return his love: His care anſwered his love; and if his ſucceſſe had anſwered his care, we might happily have this day wanted an object of ſo great ſorrow, in enjoying him. His writings were not read without ſatisfaction: His Sermons were never heard without an approving ſilence, ſeldom without a following advantage. His kindneſs towards you could not be conſidered without love, his awfull gravity, and ſecretly-commanding preſence, without reverence: Nor his converſation, without imitation. To ſee him live, was a provocation to a godly life; to ſee him dying, might have made any one aweary of living. When God reſtrains him from this place (which was alwayes happy in his company but now) he made his chamber a Church, and his bed a Pulpit, in which (in my hearing) he offered many a hearty prayer for you: And his death made him mindfull of you, whoſe life made you unmindfull of him. And I did not ſee that any thing made him ſo backward to reſign up his pure ſoul to God, as his unparalell'd care for you, and your proficiency in godlineſs, which ſeemed as

little

little to him, in comparison of what he desired, as it does great to others in comparison of what they finde; so that I sate by him, and I only, when with as great a fluency of Tears, as words, he prayed, Lord (with some ingeminations) charge not on me the ignorance of this people. And indeed your ignorance had not been so remarkable, had not his Knowledge, and desire still to communicate it been so. With what a grace and majesty have you heard him Preaching, who is now (alas) confin'd to a worser wood. Could you ever resist the power by which he spake; or find in your hearts to contradict any thing that ever he said, but when on his sick-bed he said, I am a dying man? Ah! who would not there have contradicted him, if they should not have contradicted Gods Decree! His Wisdome, Justice, and Tenderness were such predominant Graces in him, that it is as much my inability to describe them, as my unhappinesse not to imitate them: And truly, to think to expresse them, were infinitely to injure their greatness. It is a sad thing that so many resplendent graces should never be so truly, nor so fully discovered, as by the loss of him that had them; and that we should not so justly consider that he had them, till we have not them. But yet your losse might be the better borne, if ye were sure it had nothing of a Judgement in it. But I fear that within a short time, it will appear as truly, that God hath taken him away in anger, as now it appears sadly, that he hath taken him away: And that it is not only a misery that must be repayred by a change of Pastors, but also a sin which must be redrest by the change of your lives: For, if your unworthinesse have driven your teacher into a corner, and you sinn'd him into his grave; your Repentance and Humiliation must raise another out of his ashes. So great, so sad,

so

the most desired Mr. *Dyke*.

By Mr. *Samuel Shaw*, then School-master of the Free-School at *Tamworth*.

With a face sadder then usuall, with an heart sadder then my face, but upon an occasion sadder then them both, I (who was deputed to this work by him to whom I now perform it) am here, rather to receive the expressions of your sorrow, then tell you the resentments of mine own. Being sensible of my stupefaction, (caused, not through the want of my affections, but the want of their object) I desire out of a pious pollicy, to supply my dryness, by taking your Tears, and putting them into my pump, so hoping to revive mine own, which yet I judge are rather drowned then dryed up. And yet when I have done this, I know that all my expressions will fall short of the greatness of my grief, as much as my grief does of the greatness of its cause. This numerous Company of Pious groaners, these so many blacks, not made, but occasioned to be Mourners (badges of profession becomming badges of that grief, which for its greatness can be equal'd by nothing but their former happiness which they once enjoyed) the universall gloominess of this day, represents to me rather the funerall of a Town, then a man, and the fall of a Church, rather then a single pillar: and rather induces

me to think that yè áre come to quench the unmercifull heat of a feaver, then only to bedew that which was the ſubject of one. But if it may be, hold a little, and ſuffer your eyes a while to a new employment, even to ſee where you are, what you are doing, whoſe Obſequies you are ſolemnizing with ſo great devotion, and take the dimenſions of your loſſe, if it be capable of any: which indeed is ſo great, that they only can know it, who knew not him, and they onely can feel, who never enjoy'd him; I ſpeak not to aggravate your loſs, but the ſenſe of it, as for the cauſe of it, it admits of no addition. Whilſt he lived, it was as impoſſible for him not to love you, as it was for you adequately to return his love: His care anſwered his love; and if his ſucceſſe had anſwered his care, we might happily have this day wanted an object of ſo great ſorrow, in enjoying him. His writings were not read without ſatisfaction: His Sermons were never heard without an approving ſilence, ſeldom without a following advantage. His kindneſs towards you could not be conſidered without love, his awfull gravity, and ſecretly-commanding preſence, without reverence: Nor his converſation, without imitation. To ſee him live, was a provocation to a godly life; to ſee him dying, might have made any one aweary of living. When God reſtrains him from this place (which was alwayes happy in his company but now) he made his chamber a Church, and his bed a Pulpit, in which (in my hearing) he offered many a hearty prayer for you: And his death made him mindfull of you, whoſe life made you unmindfull of him. And I did not ſee that any thing made him ſo backward to reſign up his pure ſoul to God, as his unparalell'd care for you, and your proficiency in godlineſs, which ſeemed as

little

little to him, in comparison of what he desired, as it does great to others in comparison of what they finde; so that I sate by him, and I only, when with as great affluency of Tears, as words, he prayed, Lord (with some ingeminations) charge not on me the ignorance of this people. And indeed your ignorance had not been so remarkable, had not his Knowledge, and desire still to communicate it been so. With what a grace and majesty have you heard him Preaching, who is now (alas) confin'd to a worser wood. Could you ever resist the power by which he spake; or find in your hearts to contradict any thing that ever he said, but when on his sick-bed he said, I am a dying man? Ah! who would not there have contradicted him, if they should not have contradicted Gods Decree! His Wisdome, Justice, and Tenderness were such predominant Graces in him, that it is as much my inability to describe them, as my unhappinesse not to imitate them: And truly, to think to expresse them, were infinitely to iniure their greatness. It is a sad thing that so many resplendent graces, should never be so truly, nor so fully discovered, as by the loss of him that had them; and that we should not so justly consider that he had them, till we have not them. But yet your losse might be the better borne, if ye were sure it had nothing of a Judgement in it. But I fear that within a short time, it will appear as truly, that God hath taken him away in anger, as now it appears sadly, that he hath taken him away: And that it is not only a misery that must be repayred by a change of Pastors, but also a sin which must be redrest by the change of your lives: For, if your unworthinesse have driven your teacher into a corner, and you sinn'd him into his grave; your Repentance and Humiliation must raise another out of his ashes. So great, so sad,

so

so generall is this losse, that I am ready to excuse my self, and think it more reason then passion, if in my solitary mournings, and retired complaints, I cry out, My Father, my Father, the horsemen of England, *and the Charriot thereof. To tell you of his worth in a measure proportionate to my experience, would require too long a discourse from your Infant-Orator. And to tell you of your losse, I have said too much already: which although it do not answer many of your expectations, yet I hope may conduce to the affecting of you to an attention to him, whose eloquence can represent your losse, and whose wisedome can teach you how to make the best use of it.*

ERRATA.

Pag. 1. line *ult. for* And *read* In. p. 2. l. 24. a *Ruler*, r. the *Rule*. p. 5. l. 16. *for* This r. Thus. l. 17. *for* This r. Thus. p. 12. l. 11. *for* ἐγλεκτικὴ r. ἐκλεκτικὴ l. 13. *for* Art r. out. p. 20. l. 28. *dele* and wise

To the Reader.

READER,

THat *I might ſatisfie the deſire of ſome worthy Freinds, I do here preſent unto thee a Sermon (with very little alteration) preached at the Funerall of that Godly and Learned Miniſter of* Jeſus Chriſt, *Mr.* Blake, *now with God: Being the rather induced thereunto, becauſe I know the memory of his Name, will be very gratefull and welcome to ſuch who were acquainted with him. How ſadly his death was laid to heart, the deportment of many at that time did abundantly manifeſt, and Although I cannot ſpeak the ſame which* Nazianzen *affirmeth concerning the Funeral ſolemnities of* Baſil, *how that many thouſands were there preſent,*

preſent, ſome whereof by the violent preſs were killed, being happy in this (as he Rhetoricateth) that they dyed with him, as alſo that Jews and Heathens did ſtrive with Chriſtians, who ſhould pour out greater plenty of Tears, yet ſo many declared their Affections by weeping eyes, that we may ſay, Behold how they loved him. But I forbear this ſad ſubject. The Lord Chriſt, that chief Shepherd of ſouls provide for his Church ſucceſſively in all ages ſuch Paſtors, who ſhall feed his People after his own mind, and that with Truth, Zeal and Concord they may be found doing his work, when their Maſter ſhall come.

Sutton-Coldfield,
Octob. 19. 1657. *Thy ſouls well-willer,*

Anthony Burgeſſe.

A

SERMON

At the FUNERAL of the Reverend Mr. *Thomas Blake*, Miniſter of the GOSPEL.

ACTS 20. 36, 37, 38.

And when he had thus ſpoken, he kneeled on the ground, and prayed with them all:
And they all wept ſore, and fell on Pauls *neck, and kiſſed him;*
Sorrowing moſt of all for the words which he ſpake, that they ſhould ſee his face no more.

IN the latter part of this Chapter, we have *Paul* making his own Funeral Sermon; and the words of a *dying Paſtor*, whoſe Face they ſhall never ſee more, are to be like *goads and nails*, yea, *fiery nails*, as the *Septuagint* render it, *Eccleſ.* 12. 11. And this

valedictory Sermon, we know not whether the *matter*, or the *affection* in the delivering of it, be more admirable: It's milk that cometh hot from the breast; excellent matter, without hearty affections, is like a Messenger without feet, and a Bird without wings. I shall not make a Sermon upon his Sermon, onely in the general; by that discourse we have a description of a *Pastor* and *Officer* in the Church, *in Idea* and *in subjecte*: *In Idea*, or in the *Thesi*, there the Apostle describeth such by their name and titles, they are *Overseers* and *Elders*, *v.*17. from the *efficient cause* the Holy Ghost hath made them so, from the *relation they are in*: The People are their Flock, and they are Gods Church. And lastly, from the *dignity and high thoughts put upon them by Christ*, they were purchased with his own blood, shall we think our labor, our pains, our sweat, too much, when Christ thought not his blood too much?

To enter upon the Controversie who these *Elders* and *Overseers* were, is repugnant to the occasion at this time: Then you have this office *in subjecto*, *in Hypothesi*; in the practice of it, you have the rule of a *Pastor*, and the example of a *Ruler*, and that is in *Paul* himself: O the *zeal*, *watchfulness*, the *diligence*, the *courage*, the *purity* of *aime* and *ends*, which he professeth in his Ministerial discharge! not that he speaketh these for ostentation, but imitation; for he would not have said thus much of himself, saith *Grotius* on the place, but that hereby he would leave a *patern* or *form of life* to all successors; Insomuch, that no Minister read-

reading *Pauls* expreſſions of himſelf in this place, but may cry out, O me! a clod of earth to ſuch a Star, Ice to ſuch a Fire, a worm to ſuch an Angel! Though he were a *Paul*, as ſome think his name denoteth, little in ſtature of his body, yet he was a Gyant in Gifts and Graces, ſo that Papiſts themſelves cannot but give the pre-eminence to *Paul* above *Peter*, in reſpect of Doctrine and Miniſterial abilities: He was the *earthly Angel*, the *Cor Chriſti*, the *Tuba Evangelii*, as the Ancients call him; yet I am not of *Amyraldus* his minde, *conſider.* in *cap.* 7. *ad Rom.* who denying the Interpretation of the ſeventh of the *Romans*, to be underſtood perſonally of *Paul*, thinking this would be injurious to the Grace of God ſanctifying of him, and making him ſo eminent a Servant in his Church: He affirmeth, that if God pleaſed ſo to adorn *Paul* with the gifts of the Spirit, that he ſhould in this life arrive at that fulneſs and perfection of holineſs, which other Believers obtain no where but in Heaven, that thereby he might be propounded as a perfect example to all Chriſtians, and his Miniſtry be more happily efficacious; here was not (ſaith he) any thing to be blameworthy: But though we grant *Paul* to have an elder Brothers portion in the Graces and Gifts of Chriſt, ſo that if no Miniſter could be ſaved, unleſs he were a *Paul*, wo be to us all; yet that *Paul* was not above the combate of the fleſh and ſpirit within him, appeareth partly *in that careful* keeping down of his body, 1 *Cor.* 9. 27. leſt ſin ſhould prevail; as alſo in thoſe buffetings of Satan which

he was exerciſed with, that he might not be lifted up above meaſure, 2 *Cor.* 12. 7. Well, however it be, the Apoſtle having both by rule and example, as you heard deſcribed what a Miniſter or Paſtor is to be, we have the conſequent of this in my Text: When he had thus ſpoken, thus of himſelf, and thus of a Goſpel-Miniſter, he kneeled down and prayed.

There are two actions of the body mentioned in Prayer, which denote that excellent deportment that ſhould be at that time in the ſoul; kneeling of the body, that denoteth ſelf-humiliation; lifting up the hands, that implieth faith and confidence: Thus *deſcendendo aſcenditur*, how hardly do the people of God keep theſe two Graces co-operating together, but either their Humiliation abateth their Faith, or their Faith hindreth their Humiliation; both theſe together are the *Calidum* and the *Humidum*, which maintain the life of holy Duties; he Prayed as well as kneeled, for that is the onely key to open Heaven, that is *Davids* Harp, to allay all thoſe unruly affections that are apt to diſturb us.

Laſtly, here is the effect of all upon the Auditors, which is expreſſed, Firſt, In their paſſion of weeping, with the aggravation. 1. *They wept ſore.* 2. Their great love, *They fell on Pauls neck and kiſſed him.* 3. The motive of all this affectionate carriage, That which did open theſe Flood-gates, it was becauſe *they ſhould ſee his face no more*; they ſhould for ever loſe him, enjoy no more of his Miniſterial Labors and diligence: now this is recorded

corded by the Evangeliſt; as a commendation; It was a ſpirituall, not a naturall weeping; It was not like weeping for a dead Father, or a dead Wife, but for a dead Paſtor, by whoſe ſpirituall labours their ſouls had made great proficiency; I ſhall from theſe words obſerve two doctrines ſuitable to the two conſiderable parts of this auditory, the one ſeaſonable for the *Miniſters of the Goſpel* here preſent, The other opportune for the *Congregation of Tamworth*, now bereaved of a *faithful Paſtor*, whom I may ſee *mourning* and *weeping*, and that *moſt of all*, becauſe *you ſhall ſee his face no more*, you ſhall not behold him in this place again, you ſhall not hear his voice from hence again. The firſt Obſervation is grounded upon theſe words, *when he had thus ſpoken*, This about the *duty of a Miniſter*, This about *his Holy, Godly*, and *exemplary converſation*; From whence obſerve,

That a faithful diſcharge of the miniſteriall Office doth bring unſpeakable comfort to ſuch as can upon juſt grounds aſſume this to themſelves; From this faithfulneſs we ſee often *Paul* receiving a great deal of comfort. 2 *Tim.* 4. 6,7,8. The time of his departure was at hand; doth not this then make him afraid? how ſhall he give an account concerning the improvement of his talents? No, *I have fought a good fight, I have finiſhed my courſe, &c.* We have the like glorious profeſſion made by this holy Apoſtle, *Theſſ.* 2,3,4,5,6. which is an excellent Copy for every Miniſter to write after, to live and breathe from thence; and in this he is ſo cleare, that he ſaith, *Ye are witneſſes*, and God alſo, how

holily, justly and *unblameably, we have behaved our selves amongst those that beleeve.* But yet let none think that *Paul* doth thus magnifie inherent grace, to exclude imputed grace, for 1 *Cor.*4. 4. Though he saith, he knoweth nothing by himself, yet he concludeth, *I am not thereby justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord,* he knew more evill in *Paul,* then *Paul* him self could do, and certainly, so great is this ministerial work, that *Paul* himself cryed out, *Who is sufficient for these things ? Chrysostome* hath very discouraging passages, as if few Ministers could be saved, but his meaning must be, because few are carefull, zealous, and diligent; Otherwise such as *Chrysostome* himself, that is said to fear nothing but sin, and those that by their Doctrin and life, turn many from iniquities, shall have more then ordinary glory in heaven; To amplifie this, I shall in some *particulars* or Characters describe how, or when the Ministery is faithfully discharged, what is ingredient thereunto, or constituent thereof; And first there is required *an inward experimental savory work of grace upon the Ministers own heart,* that thereby he may more *affectionately* and *cordially* deal with others; when we know the terror of the Lord, and the love of Christ experimentally, this maketh us able in the work of the Ministery, 2 *Cor.* 5. 11. I doe not say that the Office of a Minister is null, if he be not a regenerate man, or as if he were no Minister, or might not be usefull in the Church of God, but as to himself, he cannot faithfully discharge this Office, so as to obtaine a crown of glory hereafter, unless

unleſs he be thus qualified; There is *Theologia ratiocinativa* and *experimentalis*, as *Gerſon* ſpeaketh. A man may know things, as *Aquinas* ſaith, *per modum cognitionis*, or, *per modum inclinationis*; now it is this experimental Divinitie, that worketh beſides Knowledge an inclination and propenſitie to the thing known, that maketh us able to diſcharge this duty; To Preach of Regeneration, of Faith, when a man hath no ſavory underſtanding of theſe things, is to talk of the ſweetneſs of honey, when we never taſted it, or of the excellency of ſuch a Countrey, which we never were in, but know it by Mapps only. If thou knoweſt the truths of God, but by Books, by Authors onely, and thy own heart feeleth not the power of theſe things, Thou art but as the Conduit, that letteth out wine or refreſhing water to others, but thou thy ſelf taſteſt not of it, or like the hand that directeth the Paſſenger, but thou thy ſelf ſtandeſt ſtill.

2. To a faithfull diſcharge, there is required a *ſound knowledge*, *judgement* and *skill in divine things*; hence they are called *lights*, *guides*, and *Shepherds*, they are required to be διδακτικὸι 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. *apt to teach, to reprove in all Doctrine.* 2 *Tim.* 4. 2. It is not enough to cry out of Hereſies or of ſinnes, unleſs we rebuke with doctrine; The leaſt Knowledge that *Caſuiſts* condeſcend unto in a Miniſter is, that he muſt be learned, *ſupra vulgus fidelium:* Is he a fit Miniſter that can onely Preach and pray by a preſcript, or form from another? He is not a fit Phyſitian, or a fit Lawyer, that ſhould doe ſo in his way; Miniſters therefore ſhould take that

that exhortation, which we see *Paul* gave even to *Timothy*, though so well accomplished, 1 *Tim.* 4. 15. *Meditate upon these things, give thy self wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear*, yea, *vers.* 13. *Till I come, give attendance to reading.* The circumstance of time is to be observed, for though *Paul* was to come shortly to him, yet that little time he was absent from *Paul*, must be improved in reading Gods Word. Be thou a scribe instructed for the Kingdome of heaven, that can bring out of thy treasure, old and new; be a Fountain, not a Cestern, that will quickly be dry; *Cajetan Summula, Tit. Doctoratus*, maketh it a mortall sinne to approve any for a Doctor in Divinitie, who is notably insufficient, because hereby he is testified to be a Physitian of souls, when yet through his ignorance, may be the ruine of many; I dare not avouch that of *Luther*, who said it is a German Proverb, *that young Divines fill Hell*, onely it is a good warning, that such be diligent in studying, that God may blesse them with all knowledge and understanding, first in the Scripture, and then in all other parts of Divinitie, whether controversall, positive or practicall, especially adde to thy Ministeriall knowledge these two things; First *a firm faith*, for to read and to know much, but not to digest it, maketh us scepticall; Have faith, not reason or opinion in religious things, *Calvin* saith in *Comment. 2. Epist. ad Corin.* that the Ministers of of God, who go up into the Pulpit in the name of Christ, to preach his Word, ought to have such firmness of Faith in them, that they are assured that

that their Doctrine can no more be overthrowne, then God himself; now truely, this faith is much to be commended to us, we may have much learning, much reading, but little Faith, be very sceptical, and deale in Divinitie as we use to do in Philosophy, *videtur quod sic*, *videtur quod non*, Great Schollars are not alwayes great beleevers, The want of this maketh a man of a *Socinian* faith, an *Arminian* faith, a Popish faith, as often as any plausible Argument, or carnal Interest interposeth.

2. With this knowledge labour much after *Casuisticall Divinity*, whereby you may be able to direct the tempted in cases of Conscience, To guide the afflicted in soul, what they are to doe; Indeed the Papists have a deale of Casuisticall divinitie in large voluminous discourses, but it is for the most part calculated according to their meridians of superstitious usages and Customes, but it is pitty that among us *Protestants*, our controversall Bookes are farre more then our casuisticall, yet remember the Scripture calleth it, *the tongue of the Learned, Isa.*50.4. *To know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary*; The wounds of Conscience are the most tender, and therefore require a Spirituall skilfull Physitian. The Consciences of men are the subject matter of your Office, and therefore look after that *Ars Cordis*, which is indeed a liberall art that will set us free.

3. He that will faithfully discharge the Office of his Ministery, must regard the *end of it*, the

finis operis, and *finis operantis*, the *finis ministerii*, and *ministri*, must be all one: The end of the Ministry is to exalt God & Christ, to dethrone Satan, to bring many out of their sins unto the obedience of the Gospel: Now if a man aim at other things in his Ministry then this, he can never comfortably discharge it: To be a Minister for earthly profits, for ambition and vain glory, these will be like the gravel, that will presently stop the Ship in its passage; and truly herein we may much lament our entrance in to this work, how many set upon it as a profession to live upon, by that they hope to satisfie their needs, but if this end and motive do still reign in thee, it will be like a milstone about thy neck; outward maintenance may be a secondary end, but not the principal; still then awe thy soul with the end of thy office, that all other knowledge is exercised about the body, or mens Estates, or the nature of things; but thine is Theology, *De Deo, à Deo, in Deum*, its concerning God objectively, its from God effectively, its to God finally.

4. He that will faithfully discharge this Office of the Ministry, must as *Paul* professeth, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. *have his conversation with all godly simplicity and sincerity*: He is to carry on his work in Scripture-ways, avoiding those two Rocks, *Media violentiæ*, and *Media fraudulentiæ*; A man of a crafty multiplicity of Spirit, will turn into any shape, dispute for any thing as lawful: This the Jesuit said to one (for so I understand it) who doubted about something he was to do, whether

ther lawful or no, *Aude* (ſaith he) *& nos efficiemus probabile, Janſen. St. Auguſt. lib. proæm. pag. 9.* Be daring to do it, and we will make it probable; now this ſimplicity of Spirit in Miniſterial imployment, is greatly ſeen in an obedientiall dependance upon the word of God, whether in matter of Duty, or of Faith: What is it that maketh ſo many learned Men embrace Errors after Errors, but becauſe they leave Faith, and attend to reaſon? They think we come to be Chriſtians by Diſputations and ſcientifical Demonſtrations; as we come to be Philoſophers, not by a ſingle and plain captivating of our underſtandings to the ſcripture, whereas it is Chriſtian Faith, not Chriſtian reaſon: It is ſaid to be *Nazianzens* Emblem, *Theologia noſtra eſt Pythagorica*, by this ſimplicity of Spirit, a man ſhall overcome thoſe Temptations, which are uſually in Scholars to bring, *inaudita & inviſa*, ſtrange and unheard things unto our People; eſpecially let the Miniſters of the Goſpel be ſo guided by ſimplicity of Spirit, that they may avoid theſe three Rocks.

Firſt, that while they avoid a Popiſh blinde obedience to men, examining things by Scripture, they therefore do not make all things uncertain: That of *Durand* is true, whoſoever forſaketh reaſon becauſe of humane Authority, *incidit in inſipientiam beſtialem*, maketh himſelf like a Beaſt; yet let not this liberty be abuſed to licentiouſneſs, to believe nothing, to deſpiſe all thoſe Miniſterial helps which God hath vouchſafed to the Church, becauſe he is to try all things; though he muſt

try, yet he must not be always trying, *but hold fast that which is good*, 1 *Thess.* 5. 21. This liberty and particular Judgement of discerning, which God alloweth every man, is not to be opposed to that decisive Ministerial Judgement, which God hath appointed in his Church.

Secondly, under pretence of a more moderate and impartial handling of things, as not being addicted unto parties, take heed thou do not make a party of thy self, as the Sect of Philosophers, called ἐκλεκτικὴ, *Diogen. Laert. in Proem.* pretending they would be of no Sect, but choose the best Art of all; thus they made a Sect, while they condemned all.

Lastly, Take heed of being deceived under the pretence that thou doest not bring in any new matter, but new words, or thou dost digest things into a better method; for by this means, men leaving that simplicity and Scripture-dependance they once had, have corrupted their Ministerial Office, instead of a faithful discharge of it.

Fifthly, To a faithful discharge of this dreadful Office, there is required an excellent compound *of many choice Graces*, insomuch that a Ministers qualification, is like that Ointment that was to be made for the Priest onely: There must be love and compassion to Peoples Souls, which was abundantly discovered in our Savior himself: *Paul* compareth himself, sometimes to a Father, sometimes to a Mother, sometimes to a Nurse, because of this affectionate desire in him: There must be Zeal, Fortitude, and Courage, the *spirit*

of

of love and of power alſo; he is not a Miniſter, that is not *ad mille mortes paratus*, ſaid *Chryſoſtome*; *as a good Souldier endure hardſhip*, ſaith *Paul* to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 3. There muſt be Prudence and Wiſdom, elſe Love and Power will make us like *Sampſon*, without eyes; there muſt be ſalt in the Sacrifice, as well as fire; *Oportet Paſtor ſit totus oculus*, a Paſtor muſt be an *Argus*, full of eyes.

Again, there muſt be an *Heavenly heart*, contemning the world and all earthly advantages: The eye that is to ſee for others, muſt not have duſt falling into it: *Auſtin* maketh an Heretick to have ſome carnal profit or emolument that is attractive of him: There muſt be a *deſire to pleaſe God, and not men*, as *Paul* ſaith, *Gal.* 1, for ſo a man cannot be a ſervant of Chriſt: This fear to diſpleaſe men, whereby we do not reprove ſin ſo Zealouſly, ſo Cordially and Faithfully as we ſhould, hath eclipſed the comfort of ſome godly Miniſters at their death. It is too true that the Wiſe man ſaith, *The fear of a man is his ſnare*, *Prov.* 29. 25. The Camelion for fear, ſaith *Ariſtotle*, turneth into the likeneſs of every object it meeteth with.

Theſe are the ſpecial qualifications of a Godly Miniſter, whereby he will be able to ſay with *Paul*, *I have fought a good fight*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 7. Yea, with *CHRIST*, *I have finiſhed the worke thou gaveſt me to do*, *John* 17. 3. To all which muſt be added *diligence* and *labour*, all the names, they have denote labour more then glory, office more then dignitie; now in all theſe things there is one particular, which

which doth much quicken, and that is *temptation*, one of those three things, *Luther* said, made a Divine; we are not to desire temptations, but God for the most part doth prepare those Ministers, whom he intends to be serviceable, by such exercises; This is the sawing, and the polishing of the stone, by this he is brought into the deep waters, and seeth the wonderfull works of God, by this he is able to understand the depths of Satan, and by this he is adapted to be a most speciall Instrument to comfort and refresh others, when they shall see theirs is not a singular condition; they must not think none are tempted like them, for they shall find that even *Pauls* have had the buffetings of Satan, and that by these soule temptations they have learned more then all Books or authors could teach them. And thus I leave the first Doctrine, and proceed to the seco[illegible], which is.

Doct. 2. *That a Godly People cannot but affectionately mourn under the losse of their faithfull Ministers.*

You see here what these *Ephesians* did, with what affection they were moved, because they should never see *Pauls* face more; Grace doth not lie in extinguishing, but regulating affections; *Christ wept*, and they argued from thence, *behold how he loved him*, *Joh.* 11. 35, 36. So that *Nazianzens* commendation of his Mother *Nonna*, that she never wept under the many troubles she underwent, submitting all to Gods hand, was rather Stoicisme, then Christianitie; It is said of *Ambrose*, when he heard of the death of any good Mini-

Miniſter, he could not forbeare weeping; how then can a people forbeare, when their own Miniſter, their own Paſtor is taken away, ſhould not the Congregation be a valley of tears, or a place of mourners; now there are theſe grounds for it, 1. Becauſe of that experimentall ſoul-good, and ſpirituall advantage the Godly have reapt thereby; Oh! when thou ſhalt remember what quicknings, what meltings, what warming of heart thou haſt had, this will cauſe grief to think they are gone. Carnall naturall men never are affected with the loſſe of a Miniſter, they never got any good by their Preaching; it was no converting Miniſtry, no inlightning, no comforting Miniſtry to them, and therefore the loſs is no more troubleſome.

2. They muſt needs mourn, becauſe they have juſt cauſe to fear, their ſinnes have cauſed God to deprive them of ſuch helps; your unthankfulneſs, your contempt, and low thoughts of the means of grace, your unprofitableneſs and negligence, may make you mourn, for if God upon the abuſe of naturall Creatures, will take away his Wine, his Bread, his flaxe, will he not much more remove the candleſtick, for unfruitfulneſs under ſpiritual mercies; mourne then, leſt thy ſinnes, thy unfaithfulneſs, thy deadneſs and dulneſs of heart have provoked God to take ſuch guides away; yea in the third place, may not ſome mourn, who by their Diſobedience, and unwillingneſſe to ſubmit to Chriſts yoak, and oppoſition to his way, have ſo filled the Miniſters heart with grief and ſadneſs, as thereby to haſten his death, making his

his life the more uncomfortable, and causing him to mourn in secret for your stubbornness and disobedience; Thus your sinnes, not only meritoriously, but efficiently may concurre to the removing of him by death; Consider that place. *Heb.* 13.17. *Obey them that rule over you, &c. that they may give their account with joy, and not with grief*; some make this particular to relate to the former, that they may watch over your souls with joy, and not with grief, for that is unprofitable for you. A grieved Minister, a discouraged Minister cannot do his duty, so powerfully, it will be unprofitable unto you, you will find it in his study, in his sermons; A dull people are apt to make a dull Minister.

4. There is cause to mourn, because of the excellencie of the relation between a Pastor and a People, in some respects, it is above all naturall relations. They are spirituall Fathers, your souls receive good by them; They are Instrumentall to bring you unto eternal glory, and therefore there is more cause of Mourning in this respect, then when God breaketh naturall relations, no Father or Mother, or friend happily hath done that for thee which his Ministery hath done.

5. There is cause to mourn, because it is a sign of Gods anger and displeasure to a people, you are not so much to look upon it; as the losse of a man, as a token of Gods anger to the congregation; *The righteous man perisheth, and none layeth it to heart. Isaiah.*57. 1. Who knoweth what soul-

Judge-

Judgments, what bodily Judgements may hereafter come vpon you, and therefore it is for a people to be ſenſible, and mourn, when the deſire of your eies, ſo I may call the Miniſter (as well as the Wife) is taken away. The deſire of your eies, you long to ſee him in the Pulpit again, and the deſire of your eares, you long to heare him again.

6. There is cauſe to Mourn, becauſe of the ſad conſequents that many times falls upon the death of a faithfull Paſtor; ſometimes the learning and ſoundneſs of a Miniſter, keepeth a People from licentious errors, and corrupt opinions; His Gravitie and Pietie hath a ſpeciall influence upon many, but upon his removall, then the weeds of a mans heart growes up: *After my departure*, ſaith *Paul, Wolves will ariſe from among your ſelves*, *Acts* 20.29. *Pauls* preſence was a great means to hinder them.

2. What good Foundation is laid in Faith, what Godly Order may be begun? there is danger, that all theſe will die, when a Faithfull Miniſter dieth: *I wonder that you are ſo ſoon removed*, ſaith *Paul, Gal.* 1. Alas! that which the Miniſters of God have with many years diligence, many Prayers, and much oppoſition brought about, when the Miniſter is dead, may quickly be deſtroyed, ſo that we may wonder, how ſuch a Town, ſuch a place ſhould be over-run with Bryars and Thornes immediately.

3. Another ſad conſequent is ſometimes, diviſions and breaches among the People, while a

Godly Miniſter is alive, he is like a Corner Stone, that uniteth both ſides of the Wall together, but when that falls, then the wall falls with it. Then one is for this Miniſter, and another for that, then one liketh this, and another the contrary, and thus ſeeds of contention and diviſion are ſowen, which may come up too faſt, hence the preſence of a Godly, Grave, Wiſe Paſtor is very neceſſary, it is the Spirituall defence of a People, which made him cry out, when the Prophet was taken, *My father, my Father, the Chariots of Iſrael, and the horſemen thereof.* 2 *Kings* 13. 14. And now we come from the Doctrinal part to the practicall; And although my cuſtome in ſuch Sermons, is not to diſcourſe about the Dead, they being like Anatomy Lectures, for the good of the living, yet becauſe we are celebrating the Funeralls of a Learned and Godly Brother, who by his Office, was in publick ſtation in the Church of God; I ſhall briefly ſpeak to ſome few of thoſe Miniſteriall qualifications, that were in him mentioned in the Doctrine, not imitating *Nazianzen*, who in his Funerall Orations of his Father, as alſo *Athanaſius*, *Baſilius* and others induſtriouſly gathereth up every thing that may make to their praiſe, if not hyperbolically exceeding ſometimes; but I ſhall rather come ſhort of what might be ſpoken. And firſt, his Doctrinall abilities, and parts in controvsrſall points, are ſufficiently known by the Books he hath written; thoſe Children will reſemble the Father, though he left no bodily ones. It is true, there were ſome particular opinions and con-

teſts

teſts he was fallen into with other Learned men, on whoſe ſide the truth did ſtand, you will not judge it meet for me to interpoſe, onely becauſe of the difference that is ſometimes in Jndgement between Godly men, we ſee ſome by profaneneſs, gladly have it in their mouthes, ſaying, what heed is to be given to theſe Miniſters, there are not two of a minde; They write againſt one another, they have Book againſt Book, and then ſome good people they are offended; what ſhall we do, ſay they, we look upon both as Godly, and yet they cannot agree; becauſe I ſay, of this offence, I ſhall ſpeak a little to it. Firſt, that this difference amongſt our ſelves, is an old objection, The *Pagans* and the *Jewes* urged it againſt Chriſtianity, whoſe Arguments *Clemens Alexandrinus* anſwered, retorting upon them the ſame diviſions; the *Philoſophers* likewiſe objected this to the Chriſtians, when that *Synod* was gathered together at *Nice*, as the Centuriators inform us; Though *Auguſtine* (*lib. de vera religione*) brandeth them for this, that the Heathens, though they had divers ſchools, yet they had *Commune Templum*, a Common temple, which argued, they worſhipped their Gods more out of Cuſtome, then becauſe of their opinion.

2. We are to know, that all the Godly do know onely in part, perfection in knowledge, and unity is reſerved for heaven; there will be no parties, no dividing opinions, there will be no different Forms, and wayes of worſhipping of God in that place, ſo that although this difference amongſt the

Godly be as *Calvin* ſaid to *Melanthon*, *peſſimi exempli*, of a very bad example, yet if we conſider, that the meaſure of Light & grace in this world is imperfect, then we may not wonder at ſuch breaches; had not *Paul* and *Barnabas* a Paroxiſme, a ſharp fitt, for to underſtand the Word in a good ſenſe, as ſome would, becauſe the Word is uſed ſo. *Heb.* 10.24. is very improbable. *Auſtin* and *Hierome*, *Chryſoſtome* and *Epiphanius* had great conteſts.

3. The differences of Godly Miniſters are not in fundamentals; They all build gold and precious ſtones, though ſome may adde hay and ſtubble

Laſtly, a brotherly and amicable diſquiſition into truths controverſed, not fundamentall, but between Godly men, though different in Judgements, is very lawfull and uſefull, indeed if this be done with pride, paſſion, ſcornfull and diſdainfull words, deſpiſing the gifts of others, This is not a dead fly, but a dead toad in the box of ointment, that maketh the wiſe Reader think, men do regard opinions, not ſo much as they are Gods Truths, but as they are their opinions, wherein they muſt have glory; But return we to our Learned Brother; as God had given him ſuch Doctrinall Abilities, ſo alſo was he Prudent and Wiſe, and wiſe to direct ſuch as were troubled in their minde, and perplexed about what they were to doe; It is true, it pleaſed God before his ſickneſs to exerciſe him with ſome ſad

and

and black thoughts, ſometimes tending to the great dejection and diſcouragement of his ſoul, but by this we ſee, that comfort is not a flower growing in our Garden, that we can pluck up when we will, God is the God of Comfort only, he giveth it when he pleaſeth, and he taketh it away again as he pleaſeth. Chriſt had an Angel to comfort him in his Agonies, ſo that all, both Miniſters and People, are to take Goſpel-Conſolations, as mercies from heaven, not as the work of our hands.

In the next place, the diligence, conſtancy and faithfull Preaching of your Godly Paſtor is not unknown; Theſe walls, theſe ſeats can ſufficiently beare witneſs thereunto; Though you a great People, and he declining in age, yet a laborious Preacher to you, and a great Student in private: The Catechizing alſo of the younger ſort of people, diſcovered his vigilancy, and it was the earneſt deſire (as he would have you informed) and requeſt of your dying Paſtor, that the younger Perſons of this place would readily and willingly ſubmit to that order; Beſides all this, his writing for the publick good of the Church, ſtill demonſtrated his faithfulneſs and zeal herein; when the Perſecutor had cut out *Cyprians* tongue, and then baniſhed him, yet he made a ſupply by his Pen; but our Learned Brother was willing both by Tongue and Pen to edifie the Church of God, ſo that both his *opuſcula*, and his *opera* will praiſe him in the gates; *His tenderneſs of Spirit* likewiſe was exceeding much; and as in ſoft wood, wormes

ſome-

ſometimes breed to weaken it, ſo did (as you heard) diſcouragements ſometimes lie upon his ſoul, but the Lord did quickly blow over the clouds, and as I am informed, his expreſſion was, *That he dyed with full ſatisfaction of Spirit, and communion with God.*

Laſtly, you are not ignorant of the way he took about the Sacrament, that he was not for the promiſcuous Admiſſion of all thereunto; and therefore when a late Writer, Mr. *Humphreys*, would have gathered ſuch concluſions from his principles, he was willing publickly to vindicate himſelf, and to ſhew his diſſent herein; All this, though comparatively little, I have ſpoken, not to exalt man, for what have we, that we have not received, but to bleſs God, and magnifie him, who giveth ſuch gifts to men; he that praiſeth the gifts and graces of any, thereby extolleth God; as he that commendeth a Picture, magnifieth the Artificer that made it; and thus we take our dear and laſt farewell of him, and come to you, ſheep left without a ſhepheard, to you on the Sea without a Pilate; To you Orphans, without a Spirituall Father; and firſt you ſee what cauſe there is for our conſtant expectation and preparation for death; Gods own Miniſters and ſervants muſt dye, God needeth no mans labours or parts, *Moſes*, *Joſhua*, *Paul*, *Peter* muſt die, *ſola mors non habet fortaſſe*, ſaid *Auſtin*, only Death hath no may be; It may be thou mayeſt be rich, it may be thou mayeſt thrive in thy trading, it may be thou mayeſt have comfort

fort in thy Children and friends, but thy death hath no may be; Oh! let not the world, let not your Shops, let not trading take off your hearts from this Meditation, but think you hear God speaking to you, set not your house, but your souls in order, for thou must die.

And secondly, here is some comfort, though there be cause of much sorrow, that though your Faithfull Pastor he dead, yet the chief Pastor of your souls is not; He that setteth Pastors and Teachers in the Church, he that sendeth forth labourers into his harvest, he liveth for ever; as one in the Ecclesiasticall History, when newes was brought him that his father was dead, *Desine blasphemias loqui* (saith he) *pater enim meus immortalis est*, cease to speak blasphemy, for my Father is immortall; Thus let this honey fall into your gall, this Wine into your water, The great and Chief Shepheard of your souls is not dead.

Lastly, now the will of God is done, concerning our deceased Brother, your duty is to be much in *Prayer* to God, that there may be a *Joshua* after *Moses*, That God would *joyne your hearts together as one man*, to seek out a Pastor for you, which shall feed you according to his holy will; The Lord hath made a great breach upon you, be sensible of it, and seriously consider how all your soul-comforts and advantages are bound up in this matter; Ministers are compared to the Sun, and Salt, *nihil sole & sale utilius*; can you be without the Sun

Sun in the heavens? without bread for your body, so neither without this bread of life for your souls, or without this light to guide you in the wilderneſſe of this World, to eternall happineſſe.

FINIS.

The Books following are to be sold by *Abel Roper* at the Sunne against St. *Dunstans* Church in *Fleetstreet*.

In Folio.

THe *Generall History of the Turks from* the beginning of that nation. with the notable expedition of the Christian Princes against them. By *Richard Knolls.*

The Works of that famous and worthy Minister of Christ *Mr. William Perkins*, the first volume.

Ovids Metamorphosis Englished, Mythologiz'd, and represented in figures, *G. Sandys Esq;*

Dr. Fulk his Confutation of the translation and glosses of the Colledge at *Rhemes upon the New Testament*, and his own Annotations upon it.

A French, English Dixonary compiled by *Randle Cotgrave*, with another in *English and French*, with the late additions of *J. Howel* Esq;

Theatrum Botanicum, the Theater of Plants, or an universal *compleat Herbal*, composed by *John Parkinson* the Kings Herbariste.

The famous and memorable Works of *Josephus*. a man of much honour and learning among the Jews, translated into English by *Tho. Ledge* Dr. in Physick.

The holy Court in five Tomes, written in French by *N. Caussin*, and translated in English by Sir *Th. Hawkins* and others.

The Philosophy commonly called the *Morals*, written by the learned Philosopher *Plutarch*, translated into English by *Ph. Holland* Dr. in Physick.

The general practice of Physick, containing all the diseases and infirmities incident to the body of man, and by what meanes they may be remedied, a a Book of singular use to all that are *studious* in Physick.

Government and obedience as they stand directed and determined by Scripture and reason, by *John Hall.*

The Country Justice, containing the practice of the Justices of the Peace out of their Sessions much enlarged by the anthour *Michael Dalton*, and an Appendix added of all such late Acts and Ordinances, as are to be put in execution by Justices of the Peace.

The History of *Titus Livius* that famous Romane History newly revised and enlarged, with a supplement, rendred in English by an able hand.

The history of Venice, with *the Wares of Cyprus*, written in *Italian* by *Paulo Paruta*, and put into English by *Henry Earl of Monmouth.*

In Quarto.

Itinerarium totius Sacræ Scripturæ, the travel of the holy *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, *Judges*, *Kings*, *our Saviour Christ and his Apostles*, with a description of the Towns and places, also a Treatise of the *weights* and *measures* mentioned in the Scriptures, and reduced to our English valuation, quantity and weight by *H. Bunting*, a work of excellent use for the understanding of the holy Scriptures.

Admirable events, with moral relations written in *French*, by *Peter Camus* Bp. of *Belley* and translated into English by *S. V.*

A Treatise of *Policy* and *Religion* by *Tho. Fitzherbert*, Esq;

The history of Episcopacy from our Saviours time, by *P. Heylin* D. D.

Vindiciæ fœderis, a Treatise of the Covenant of God entred into with mankinde in the several kinds and degrees of it much enlarged by its Author Mr. *Thomas Blake*, Minister of the Gospel, a little before his death, unto which is annexed a *Sermon preached at his Funeral*, by Mr. *Anthony Burgesse*, and a Funeral oration made upon his death by Mr. *Samuel Shaw.*

The Covenant sealed, or a Treatise of the Sacraments of both Covenants, polemical and practical, especially of the Sacraments of the Covenant of grace, by Mr. *Thomas Blake.*

— His Answer to Mr. *Tombes* letter in vindication of the Birth-priviledge, or Covenant-holinesse of beleevers and their issue in the time of the Gospel, together with the right of Infants to baptism.

Three Sermons preached by Master *Thomas Jacomb* Min. of *Mart. Ludgate.*

1. *Enochs walk and change*, at the Funeral of the Reverend Mr. *Richard Vines* on *Gen.* 5.24.

2. *The active and publick spirit*, at *Pauls* upon *Acts* 13.36. former part.

3. *Gods mercy for mans*, at the spittle upon *Mat.* 5.7.

Twelve Sermons preached upon several eminent and publick occasions by that learned Orthodox and powerful preacher, Mr. *Richard Vines.*

The Birth of mankinde, the womans book, or a guide for women in their conceptions, bearing and suckling their children, illustrated with figures by *Tho. Reynald* Dr. of Physick.

The perfect conveyancer, or several select and choice, Presidents collected by four several Sages of the Law.

Rules and Orders for the regulation of the Court *of the Upper Bench*, published by the Judges of that Court.

Rules and Orders for the regulation of the Court of the *Common Bench*, published by the Judges thereof.

Orders for the regulation of the High Court of *Chancery.*

The Sum of a conference between *John Rainolds* and *John Hart*, touching the head and faith of the Church.

The whole art of Husbandry by *Barnaby Googe* Esq; enlarged by *Garv. Markham.*

God

Gods mercy mixed with his Justice, laid open in Several Sermons by that learned and judicious Divine Mr. *John Cotton.*

A discovery of the *deceitfulnesse of mans heart* by *Daniel Dyke* B. D.

The Assize of bread by *John Penkithman.*

Via recta ad vitam longam, with a Treatise of Bathes, and of Tobacco, by *Tho. Venner* Doctor in Physick.

Considerations upon common fields and inclosures, wherein is shewed the benefit of inclosures.

The Posing of parts by *John Brinsley.*

A paraphrase upon *Solomons* Song, by *George Sandis* Esq;

Bucanus common places in English.

A Discourse of the visible Church, by *Fr. Fulwood* Minister of the Gospel.

A true relation of a dispute between *Francis Fulwood* Minister, and on *Tho. Salthouse* a Quaker.

The noble order, or the honor which God confers on them that honour him, in a Sermon preached before the house of Lords, on *1 Sam.* 2.30. by *Daniel Evance.*

The growth and spreadiug of heresie, set forth in a Sermon preached before the house of Commons on *2 Pet.* 2.2. by *T. Hodges.*

Pauls last farewel, or Sermon preached at the Funeral of that godly and learned Minister of Jesus Christ Mr. *Thomas Blake* by Mr. *Anthony Burgesse*, Pastor at the Church at *Sutton Cold-field* in *Warwick-shire.*

The Countrey-Girle } Playes.
Mercurius Britanicus }

In Octavo.

Lexicon Greco latinum in novum Testamentum *Georgio Pasore.*

Piscator in omnes Epistolas in Nov. Test.

The story of stories, or the life of Christ according to the four Evangelists with the harmony of them.

Haynes Lat. Grammar.

Divine and moral speculations in metrical numbers upon various subjects, by Dr *Robert Aylet.*

Hoptons Concordance of years enlarged.

Rastalls computation of the years of our Lord, with the years of the Reigns of all the Kings of *England.*

Clavis Graeca Linguae.

Leicesters Common-wealth.

Corderius translated Gramatically, by *John Brinsly.*

Ovids Metamorphosis Gramatically translated by *John Brinsley.*

Ovids Festivals translated into English verse.

Sandys paraphrase on the *Psalmes* of *David*, and upon the Hymnes in the Old and New Testament.

The practice of the high Court of *Chancery* with the nature of the several offices belonging to that Court, and the reports of many choice Cases.

Reports of special Law Cases, touching the Customes and Liberties of the City of *London*, by Sir *H. Culthrop* Recorder of *London.*

The History of *Massianello* of *Naples* the second part.

The Italian Convert, or the life of *Galeacius Carracciolus*, his admirable conversion from Popery, and forsaking

a rich Marqueſdom for the Goſpels ſake, illuſtrated with ſeveral figures.

Horatii Poemeta Annotationibus, *Joannis Bond.*

The benefits of Chriſts death.

A Sermon preached at *Suſſex* Aſſizes by *Zachæus Montague.*

A new A.B.C. or a ſhort Catechiſm according to the rules and direction for ſuſpenſion from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, in caſe of ignorance by *John Buckley.*

In 12.

St. Auguſtines Confeſſions tranſlated, and with Marginal notes illuſtrated, wherein divers Antiquities are explained by *W. Wats.* D. D.

The Compleat Angler, being a diſcourſe of rivers, fiſh-ponds, of fiſh and fiſhing.

A help to Engliſh hiſtory, containing a ſucceſſion of all the Kings, Dukes, Marqueſſes, Earles and Biſhops, with a deſcription of all the chief places in *England*, the names and ranks of the Viſcounts and Barons, and a Catalogue of the Baronets and Knights.

Ovids Metamorphoſis Engliſhed, by *G. Sandys* Eſq;

The hiſtory of *Scotland* during the minority of K. *James*, by *Robert Johnſton.*

Eſops Fables Engliſh.

Moretons threefold ſtate of man.

Spare minuits, or reſolved Meditations, by *Arthur Warwick.*

Satyræ ſeriæ, or the ſecrets of things written in moral and politick Obſervations.

Withers Britans remembrance, ſecond part.

—His *Pſalmes* 16.

Jueli Apologia.—

The Devout Chriſtian Communicant, by *Nicholas Hunt.*

M. *Annæus Lucanus* de Bello Civili.

A *Copy Book* of all the uſual hands written in *England*, methodically digeſted, as may beſt direct ſuch practioners in writing, as want the aſſiſtance of a Maſter.

The true way to heaven, or a *Chriſtian ſtore-houſe*, a Book of Prayers and Meditations for every day of the week, morning and evening, alſo prayers fitted for all occaſions, by *John Gee.*

FINIS.